




• Ex Libris
Duquesne University:



EXT. 4
Co. 3000



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

Historic Origin and Social Development
of Family Life in Russia

Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia

BY

ELAINE ELNETT, Ph.D.

FORMERLY ASSISTANT IN CIVIC EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTOR
IN ADULT IMMIGRANT EDUCATION IN TEACHERS
COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

WITH A PREFACE BY

FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



New York

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1926

DK

32

E 5

1926a

~~392~~

~~E 48~~

Copyright, 1926

By COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Printed from type. Published December, 1926

Printed in the United States of America

PREFACE

OTHERS who are better qualified than I am will pass judgment upon the technical scholarship of Mrs. Elnett's essay; upon the authenticity of the sources which she has used, the accuracy of her translations, and the validity of her inferences. Assuming that the facts alleged have been verified, I welcome this study as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of folk ways and folk beliefs. This is the knowledge without which we cannot understand the deeper differences between one people and another, and, as William Graham Sumner made clear, it is indispensable material for descriptive and historical sociology, and therefore for an inductive theory of what human society is and does.

In the development of the human family every phase of belief from the crudest superstition to the most sophisticated rationalization has appeared. Also every possible experiment in social organization through matrilineal and patrilineal tribal systems to complex national states is tied up with the succession of family forms. In taking the development of the family in Russia as her central theme, therefore, Mrs. Elnett has brought into the picture a very significant expression of the Russian mind from primitive times to the present moment. It may be doubted if anywhere else in the world the material survives for a history of this kind through so long an experience and through so many evolutionary changes as in Russia. It is a history that shows us glimpses of emergence from primal

savagery and ends only with the turmoil and chaos of revolution.

Mrs. Elnett has seen this material in a large way, and has been successful in so analyzing it as to bring out the complexity of relationships. The result is a fine body of significant conclusions in general and in detail.

FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS.

INTRODUCTION

THE object of this study is to bring together in united and consistent form the story of the changes which have taken place in the organization of Russian family life and in their relation to the social institutions of the country. In view of the general interest which the sociological material offered by Russia affords, we earnestly hope that this small volume may fill a real gap in sociological literature.

The Russian Slavs are, as a racial group, unique among the racial groups of the present-day world: they are an heir to no definite civilization. The great civilizations of the East have left their unmistakable impress upon the peoples who are to-day the racial descendants of the creators of these civilizations. Western Europe is the inheritor of the humanistic cultures that had their rise and fall on the shores of the Mediterranean, but came to life once more in the epoch of the Renaissance. Russia—in Europe, but scarcely of Europe; in Asia, but still less of Asia—has been less fortunate in this respect than her neighbors either in Europe or in Asia.

Russia is a late-comer in the family of civilized nations. At the time of the Renaissance in Western Europe, the Slavic principalities scattered over the vast wooded plain of Eastern Europe were still engaged in a life-and-death struggle for national consolidation and independence from their Tartar overlords. Later on, while Eastern Europe basked in the sun of intellectual and artistic rebirth, Russia, though united and

independent, was plunged in the ceaseless, almost Herculean struggle of building up a national consciousness and a national economy.

Isolated by distances and by the lack of means of communication, grappling with savage and as yet untamed nature, the Russian communities gradually adopted a stern outlook on life, in which the superstitious heathenism of their earlier ages was mingled with the asceticism and mysticism of that form of Christianity which was preached to them from Byzantium. Passivity was the basis of this philosophy; fear its outstanding characteristic; unrelieved conservatism its guide in action. These features became the very basis of the social organization that grew up, deep-rooted in the consciousness of the Russian masses.

Yet that is not the whole of the story. Adversity and circumstance cowed the great masses of the people and cast them into a mold of passive obedience, but the mere existence of the potential power hidden in this passivity was a rich soil for the growth of strong individualities in positions of leadership. There is a strikingly large proportion of powerful personalities among its rulers during the first eight centuries of Christian Russia. Strong-willed and dominant, exacting blind obedience from their subjects, they expended their energies in making Russia a powerful state, based throughout its whole social structure upon the principle of hierarchic obedience. The family, the basic unit of this structure, was permeated with this principle, deep-grained and unshakable.

This was Russia of the pre-Petrine or Moscow period. Then came Peter. He saw the limitations of mere passivity and, without fully realizing the implications of his actions, he sought to inoculate Russia with the activism that made Western Europe what it was. Peter and his successors went to the West for their instruction. But what they brought back with them affected merely the surface of the Russian social

order and did not change the underlying basis even of their own lives.

One hundred years after the Petrine hurricane burst over Russia in all its fury, at the end of the eighteenth century, the contrast between Russia and Western Europe was still amazing. The whole trend of events leading to the French Revolution and the modern conception of democracy had played its rôle in Western Europe, whereas Russia was still struggling with the task of adapting the elementary side of these advances to her own conservative and passive philosophy of life.

Yet within the very next generation Europe and Russia met on common ground. Western Europe in the embodiment of Napoleon struck at Russia and sought to penetrate into the inscrutable depths of the vast country. It drew back upon itself the Russian armies that marched to the very citadel of Paris. These armies upon their return brought to Russia the latest Western forms of political agitation and the hope which this might have created for the country perished in the Decembrist uprising of 1825. But the roots remained. Peter's work was completed, though not in the way in which he dreamed. Russia became a part of Europe. The currents of Western thought and culture, that had been for centuries trickling across the frontiers of Russia, now flowed over the restraining walls. Literature, art and science blossomed out in Russia as rapidly and as brilliantly as in any country at any period. The technical inventions of the West worked their way into Russian life, and by the end of the nineteenth century Russia could point with pride to her achievements during those few decades.

Tragedy lurked beneath that brilliant and imposing exterior. Russia merely acquired the fruits of Western cultural progress; she lacked the roots of its organic growth. When the supreme test came in the upheaval of the World War and

the revolutions that followed in its wake, Russia, essentially still of the primitive pre-Petrine era, suffered cultural shipwreck.

This test disclosed one fact of paramount importance. A hurricane again furrowed deeply the surface of Russia's social life, a mightier hurricane than any of its predecessors. It, too, is rapidly spending its force. It, too, has scarcely touched the real depths.

In no phase of life is this reflected as clearly as in that unit which still remains basic in the social structure—the family. That portion of the view of life which determines family relations still remains almost unimpaired in present-day Russia. It has persisted for centuries. It affects the vast bulk of Russia's teeming millions. It is, indeed, an outstanding reality in the maelstrom of Russian development.

Russian literature is, in its major part, the reflection of the surface of Russian life. It has never been free from governmental censorship and interference; hence it is a poor guide to the depths of the social consciousness. The Russian peasant, still essentially as primitive as he was centuries ago, has stored his accumulated wisdom in his folklore, and particularly in his proverbs and sayings. Hence the importance and the emphasis given to proverbs in this study. In their deep insight into human nature, their variety, their contradictions, they are a veritable philosophy of life. It is unfortunate that the succinct and racy humor which prevades a large number of the proverbs, their wealth of rhyme and of alliteration, cannot be preserved in the translation. But even as turned into English here, they still preserve, however inadequately, at least something of their amazing original qualities.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
PREFACE BY FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS	v
INTRODUCTION	vii
CONTENTS	xi

CHAPTER I

THE PRE-PETRINE LIFE	1-45
--------------------------------	------

CHAPTER II

THE POST-PETRINE LIFE	46-89
---------------------------------	-------

CHAPTER III

THE PROVERBS	90-134
------------------------	--------

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION	135-143
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145-151

Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia

I

THE PRE-PETRINE LIFE

THE patriarchate was not the original form of family life in Russia. There are many evidences pointing toward the former existence of matriarchate. The Slavs in general do not seem to use commonly the Indo-European root for "father" (Sanskrit—pitar, Greek—pater, Latin—pater and its derivations—père, vater, etc.). According to M. N. Pokrovsky (Ocherk Istorii Russkoi Kultury), the usual Slavic word "otets" comes from a very ancient but parallel term "atta." But the Slavs knew and generally used the Indo-European term for "mother." They also had a word "netiy," signifying the sister's son.

Early Slavonic writers mentioned the absence of any prohibition of marriage between children of the same father or grandchildren of the same grandfather. Women enjoyed full independence in holding large possessions, being the heads of families and even of tribes, choosing their husbands and lovers. "To these characteristic features of matriarchate" says Prof. Kovalevsky,¹ "add a very important one, that, according to the old Russian law, the tie which unites a man to his sister and

¹ *Modern Customs and Ancient Laws in Russia*, pp. 17-18.

the children she has brought into the world, was considered to be closer than that which unites two brothers or an uncle and his nephew. In a society organized on the principle of agnatism, the son of a sister has no reason to interfere in the pursuit of the murderer of his uncle. The brother belongs altogether to another clan, and the duty of vengeance falls exclusively on the members of that clan. But such is by no means the point of view of the old Russian law, recognizing, as it does, the right of the sister's son to avenge the death of his uncle.

"In case a man should be killed by a man," decrees the first article of the Pravda of Yaroslav (the *lex barbarorum* of the Russians), "vengeance may be taken by a son, in case his father has been killed, by the father, when the son falls a victim, by the son of a sister." Later on "the son of a brother" is substituted for "the son of a sister." This proves that among the ancient Russian Slavs descent was counted only in the mother's line, that the mother and not the father was the central figure, the head of the family.

The patriarchy was taking root gradually, as the Russian Slavs were moving further north, clearing the woods and turning them into fields. This work required too much physical exertion for women; men became more important as economic factors and assumed the headship of the family. The agricultural situation was also responsible for the organization of the patriarchal family. A normal family, i.e., a family consisting of father, mother and children, could not possibly manage that work. Therefore so-called "big families" were formed, which included several generations—married sons, married daughters whose husbands were taken into the family, nephews, nieces, grandchildren, etc. While blood relationship was the basis of the "big family," adoption was quite common. Servants and illegitimate and adopted children became full-fledged members of the family. Rich men included in

their families their whole retinue, and even their captives. The earliest Russian chronicles called such big families "clans" and ascribed to them political significance.

— The head of the family, the father, held the power of life and death over his children, especially his daughters. He was the lawmaker and the judge, the arbiter of all social affairs, and the priest. Many a child fell on the altar of offerings under the sacrificial knife of its father. Parental authority was based not merely on physical strength, but it had elements of superhuman, divine significance. The very religion in its original form was of a family character and consisted of ancestor worship. The mythical personality of the "grandfather" house-spirit was the chief diety of the family. The family hearth was his altar, and the head of the family the priest and the sacrificer. The house-spirit was honored as the patronym, the eldest male member of the family, the first founder of the family hearth. Libations were poured to him as a departed spirit, and prayers were uttered in his name. Therefore each family group had its own family altar and family worship, to which no stranger could be admitted. Ancestor worship invested family life with unity, dignity and power; it served as an integrating factor.

The house-spirit was the ideal of a patriarchal master of the house, as he is called even to-day. He concerned himself with the smallest details of the household, kept a watchful eye over everybody, assisted the laborers, and even stole from other households for his family. When a member of the family died, the house-spirit would howl at night, and thus express his deep sympathy with the grief of the family. At the same time, like a truly obdurate patriarch, he would demand from the family all kinds of honors and respect, or else would become wicked and vindictive. At times he would become mischievous, play all kinds of nasty tricks and ruin the family.

This old ancestor worship may still be seen in Little Russia in the custom of having the bride stand near the hearth or the stove, toward which she stretches out her hand, while her father is discussing her marriage with the emissary sent by the bridegroom. By so doing she expresses her desire to remain under the protection of the house-spirit of her family.

Apart from the cult of the house-spirit the Russians, like all other Slavs, still venerate their deceased relatives. At certain times they not only say prayers for their dead but place food on their graves and have festivals at home where they show their belief that the unseen departed are present and are partaking of the feast.

Popular deities have the same family and patriarchal character. In primitive folk-beliefs and rites connected with them, the central place is held by the idea of a marriage between the Heaven and the Earth. The latter assumes the form of a mother of a patriarchal family, fecundated by the father—heaven.

— “It is not the Earth that gives birth, but the Heaven,” says a popular proverb, thus expressing the idea of a complete predomination in religion of the patriarchal father over the mother. In this view of the world the whole firmament was considered as one family, with the sun as the father, the head of the family. Each member of the household was not an individual but merely a component part of a collective individuality—the family to which he belonged. The worth and significance of a person consisted not in his personal virtues, merit and valor, but in his right of seniority in his family, or the seniority of his family in the tribe. The honor of the individual was based on the honor of his fatherland, his tribe. The very word honor “chest” is a derivative of “chtit” or “otchit”—to pay paternal honor. The individuality of the domestics disappeared entirely before that of the master of the house. The very name of a member of a household was

identical with that of the slave. "Rabenok," "robenok," "rebenok"—young one, child, diminutive form "rab"—slave.

Primogeniture did not exist, and after the death of the head of the family, the children either divided the property equally or held it in common and elected from their own kindred a master in their father's place. The idea of parental authority, parental guardianship and blood relationship as the only basis of society, and the filial obedience of the younger to the older members of society were at the basis of the Russian life from the very beginning of Russian history.

It is difficult to trace the evolution of the Russian family from its original patriarchal state. Even in antiquity the family hardly ever constituted a separate, independent unit, but was a part of a collective whole—a tribe.

As a historic phenomenon, the tribe was not a natural development of the family and the kindred of the "big family." Federation of "big families" into tribes, as well as the federation of tribes, was sometimes a military measure to repel common enemies of a different race, but more often it was brought about by subjugation. The tribe came into existence as a governmental unit, and gave rise to tribe government, monarchical in its form but democratic in its substance. While the leader, the prince of the tribe nominally concentrated in his hands all powers, the very office of the prince was elective. The Council of Elders, the heads of the "big families," limited the power of the prince; the Common Council was above all.

Under the tribal organization the absolute powers of the father, the head of the family, were somewhat limited. The father had to abide by the opinion and the judgment of the elders, and could not ignore the ancient traditions and customs which were observed and strictly guarded by the whole tribe. Each family, besides its own interests, had the interests of the social tribal life at heart.

The sense of tribal pride was strong. Each member was

in duty bound to guard it, because each person or even each family meant nothing as an individual, but was significant as a part of the tribe. The whole tribe avenged the dishonor of each member, but the whole tribe also rose up against the individual who dared to oppose what, according to the general consensus of opinion, was sacred and moral, the morality being composed of the accepted relations deeply enrooted among all the members. Whoever refused to obey the general demands was forced to leave his tribe, was excommunicated. He thus became an outcast, without family and tribe. He could not attach himself to any other tribe, as he was respected everywhere only as a representative of his own tribe. In this manner each family was dependent upon its tribe and each member of the family was imbued with respect toward his tribe which occupied a certain territory. The family was now ruled not by the arbitrary despotism of the father, but by the social, tribal ideal, which could not be scorned with impunity. The family strictly adhered to these ideals and was merciless to all transgressors. Yet there was no tribe without such transgressors, free thinkers and rebels, who, for sinning against tribal customs, were deprived of all their possessions and became outlaws. They hid in forests, formed their own groups of bands, became enemies of all lawfully organized families and tribes, freebooters, daring brigands, the terror of the countryside.

Isolated families and tribes were scattered through wild, uncultivated country covered with swamps and woods. They lived in wretched homesteads built at great distances from each other. Those homesteads were principalities, and the princes or heads of families were forever fighting among themselves. Authentic Russian history begins with these fights and the mutual enmity among tribes.

In view of such isolation and mutual enmity voluntary marriages among members of different tribes were extremely diffi-

cult, practically impossible. Therefore consanguine families formed by unions of brothers and sisters were quite common.

References to these incestuous relations are found in Russian folk-lore, especially in the popular ballads, called "Byliny." For instance, when Ilya of Murom asks Nightingale the Robber how it is that all his children seem to have "one face," the Nightingale replies:

"When my son grows up, I marry him to my daughter; when my daughter is old enough, I give her my son for a husband, and I do this in order that my race may not die out."

Shashkov² cites the following scene from peasant life in the province of Viatka: "A young man is lying on the stove and moaning. His mother asks him why he is moaning. It proves to be that he is ill of an unsuccessful love affair. The mother reprimands him for going with all kinds of wenches, 'as if there were not enough of our own mares,' says she, pointing to her daughters."

According to Prof. Kovalevsky³ endogamous marriages still occur in a few very remote parts of Russia, as in the district of Onega and in some parts of the government of Archangel, on the shores of the White Sea, where the peasants are in the habit of saying that marriages between blood relations will be blessed with a more rapid increase of "cattle"—the word "cattle" standing for children. In some parts of Siberia and in the district of Vetlougá, which belongs to the government of Nijny Novgorod, endogamous marriages, though contrary to the prevailing custom, are looked upon with a favorable eye.

Marriage, in the sense of a permanent union between husband and wife, was never a general custom among the Eastern Slavs, though, of course, not all the tribes, whose confederacy was the beginning of the Russian State, were ignorant of the

² *Istoria Russkoi Zhenshchiny*, p. 29.

³ *Modern Customs and Ancient Laws in Russia*, pp. 14-15.

meaning of family life. They were exogamous peoples; yet they retained from the period of almost unlimited license a sort of family communism which appears even to-day in some sections of Russia, especially in Great Russia, in the relations between fathers and daughters-in-law. Each tribe had its own customs, the laws of its forefathers and its own traditions, each its own manner of life.

The earliest historical evidence as to the social relations of the ancient Russians is contained in the so-called Chronicle of Nestor. Nestor is supposed to have been a Russian Monk of the eleventh century, who prepared for his monastery a history of his country. In this description of matrimonial usages and customs Nestor tells that not only unions between brothers and sisters but general promiscuity was quite common. Such promiscuous marriages could not be prevalent very long chiefly because of the deteriorating effect upon the posterity, and were of necessity replaced by the forcible seizure of strange women. The old Russian term for wife-stealing, "poyati zhenu," means literally to seize, to catch a wife. The custom of capturing of a wife after having covenanted with her, mentioned by Nestor is a transitional step toward marriage as a voluntary union of two independent individuals. Such capture was in reality even more progressive than the peaceful buying and selling of brides which followed it, and which still persists in the present-day marriages in the same form of presents and dowry.

Nestor characterizes some of the Russian tribes as follows:

"The Drevliane lived like beasts; they killed one another; they fed on things unclean; no marriage took place among them but they captured young girls on the banks of rivers.

"Three other Slavic tribes, the Radimichi, the Viatichi, and the Syeveriane had the same customs, they lived in forests, like other wild animals, they ate everything unclean, and shameful things occurred amongst them between fathers and

daughters-in-law. Marriages were unknown to them, but games were held in the outskirts of villages; they met at these games for dancing and every kind of diabolic amusement, and there they captured their wives, each man the one he had covenanted with. They had generally two or three wives.

"The Poliane (the most civilized Slavic nation, who were established on the banks of the Dnieper) had the customs of their fathers, customs mild and peaceful; they showed a kind of reserve towards the wives of their sons and toward their sisters, toward their mothers and their parents; toward the mothers of their wives and toward the brothers of their husbands, to all of the persons named they showed great reserve. Amongst them the bridegroom did not go to seek his bride; she was taken to him in the evening, and the following morning they brought what was given for her."

Pamphil, a monk of the Russian Abbey of Eleasar in the sixteenth century, bitterly protested against annual gatherings resembling those described by Nestor, which resulted in the corruption of young women and girls. According to Pamphil, the meetings took place, as a rule, at the summer solstice, the day before the festival of St. John the Baptist, which in pagan times was that of a divinity known by the name of Yarilo, corresponding to the Priapus of the Greeks.

The yearly festivals held on Christmas Day, on the day of the baptism of our Lord, and on St. John the Baptist, commonly called Midsummer Day, had, as their general feature, the prevalence of promiscuous intercourse of the sexes.

Ivan the Terrible took effectual measures for abolishing every vestige of paganism, among them the annual festivals. Yet they occasionally occur even now, especially the festival in June. They usually take place close to river or pond; large fires are lighted, and over them young couples, bachelors and unmarried girls, jump barefooted.

The earlier meetings on river banks gave place to evening

assemblies of the peasants, known in Great Russia under the name of Posidielki and in Little Russia as Vechernitsi.

The licentiousness, which forms the characteristic features of these meetings, throws light on the motives which induce peasants of certain Great Russian communes to attach but small importance to virginity. The comparative immorality of the Russian peasants has no other cause than the survival amongst them of numerous vestiges of the early forms of marriage.

Prof. Kovalevsky⁴ says: "The Allemanic populations of the Grisons, no longer ago than the XVIc., had regular meetings which were not less shameful than those of the Cossaks. The Kibbenen were abolished by law, but another custom, in direct antagonism to morality, continued to exist all over the cantons of Switzerland and in the southern provinces of Wurtemberg and of Baden. I mean the custom known under the name of Kirchgang or Dorfgehen, which, according to the popular songs, consisted in nothing else than the right of a bachelor to become a lover of some young girl, and that quite openly, and with the implied consent of the parents of his sweetheart. May I also mention a similar custom amongst the Welsh, known as "bundling."

Similarly Washington Irving says in his not quite scientific but interesting *History of New York*,⁵ about the Yankees of Massachusetts:

"They multiplied to a degree which would be incredible to any man unacquainted with the marvelous fecundity of this growing country.

"This amazing increase, may indeed be partly ascribed to a singular custom prevalent among them, and which was probably borrowed from the ancient republic of Sparta; where we are told the young ladies, either from being great romps and

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

⁵ B. III, ch. VI, pp. 172-3.

hoydens, or else like many modern heroines, very fond of meddling with matters that did not appertain to their sex, used frequently to engage with the men, in wrestling, and other athletic exercises of the gymnasium. The custom to which I allude was vulgarly known by the name of bundling—a superstitious rite observed by the young people of both sexes, with which they usually terminated their festivities; and which was kept up with religious strictness, by the more bigoted and vulgar part of the community. This ceremony was likewise, in those primitive times, considered as an indispensable preliminary to matrimony; their courtship commencing, where ours usually finishes—by which means they acquired that intimate acquaintance with each other's good qualities before marriage, that has been pronounced by philosophers the sure basis of a happy union. . . .

“To this sagacious custom, therefore, do I chiefly attribute the unparalleled increase of the Yankee tribe; for it is a certain fact, well authenticated by court records and parish registers, that wherever the practice of bundling prevailed, there was an amazing number of sturdy brats born unto the state, without the licence of the law, or the benefit of clergy. . . .”

In chapter VII (pp. 179–80) Irving says that the “mercurial” squatters of Connecticut penetrated into the New Netherland settlements and threw whole villages into consternation by their unparalleled volubility and their intolerable inquisitiveness. “Great jealousy did they likewise stir up, by their intermeddling and success among the divine sex; for being a race of brisk, likely, pleasant-tongued varlets, they soon seduced the light affections of the simple damsels, from their honest but ponderous Dutch gallants. Among their hideous customs they attempted to introduce among them that of bundling, which the Dutch lasses of the Netherlands, with that eager passion for novelty and foreign fashions, natural to their sex, seemed very well inclined to follow, but that their

mothers, being more experienced in the world, and better acquainted with men and things, strenuously discountenanced all such outlandish innovations." In that the Dutch mothers were different from the Slav.

The various features which characterized the lowest state of relations between the sexes did not vanish all at once. The incestuous relations between persons of the same blood seem to have been the first to disappear. Though communal marriages—fathers and sons having wives in common—are still met with, nevertheless fathers and daughters, brothers and sisters dare no longer cohabit with each other, and if license still occurs at some annual festivities, it is kept under some check.

The Byliny, the popular ballads, represent the transient period of social evolution, when endogamy was gradually giving way to exogamy, and relations between persons of the same unit were forbidden. A popular bogatyr, Mikhailo Kazarinov, liberates a young Russian girl from the Tartars and is on the point of becoming her lover when she proves to him that she is his sister. The bogatyr immediately abandons his purpose.

Many of the marriage rites of today point to different forms of marriage in antiquity. For instance, the theory of the existence of consanguine marriage among the early Russians is supported by the role played by the brother at the wedding. Whilst the father is considered to be the proper person to dispose of the hand of the bride, the brother, according to the wedding ritual, appears as the chief protector of her virginity. The brother plays a very important part in the nuptial ceremony. The brother, more than any other member of the household, is watching the sister and trying to protect her from her bridegroom—the capturer. He is dissatisfied most of all by her marriage and in some places quite violently repels the intrusion of the bridegroom. The bride-

groom pays to the brother a ransom for the privilege of taking his place next to the bride. He also pays the brother for not cutting the bride's braid—the act implying vengeance for sexual infidelity.

A whole series of dramatic acts symbolize the former marriage by capture, e.g.—all kinds of impediments are put in the bridegroom's way when he is going to get his bride; the bride's house is sometimes fenced and always defended by relatives; the bride is hidden; sometimes a real fist fight takes place, and only after these and many other acts the parties come to an understanding and agreement and permit the bridegroom to lead the bride away. The "leading away" of the bride into the bridegroom's house is the final act of the wedding ceremony. The term "led" acquired in Russia the meaning of legal wife.

Nestor's description of the capture of wives after having covenanted with them shows that the heathen Russians recognized the woman's freedom of choice and respected that freedom. During the long period, when the Russian people were entering the historical arena, the Russian woman, especially the girl, enjoyed perfect sexual freedom, protected by the purity of the primitive morals. Mothers gladly allowed their daughters to have a good time at the festivals, though they knew by their own experience that these were nothing but carnivals of licentiousness. While the woman was more or less subjected to her husband, she was not in any way doomed to eternal humiliation and slavery like her Oriental sister. The Russian woman was free to exhibit her mental ability and physical prowess and to acquire through them respect and power. The woman not only shared with the men all the hard work in procuring the means of existence but often took part in wars. The Russian girls were so free and independent and so strong physically that they often were able to withstand the man's rapacious claims and to preserve the free charac-

ter of their love unions. The primitive freedom of sexual relations persisted long after the introduction of Christianity because women spared no effort to preserve it.

The Russian Byliny depict the powerful type of Russian female warrior, the free damsel-errant, the Polyanitza, bold, daring, dauntless, possessing the strength of a giant, and often magic power.

The wife of the boyar Stavr conquers Vladimir's fighters:

"She pulls the arm out of the first fighter's shoulder, and breaks the leg of the other fighter; she grabs the third one across his back and hurls him down in the middle of the yard."

Marina is boasting of her magic power over Dobrynya:

"Heigh-ho, princesses and boyars' wives, in the capital city of Kiev there is no one craftier and wiser than I. I turned nine brave men, strong, powerful bogatyr, into bay aurochs."

The Polyanitza feels free to choose her love mates and to change them as often as she pleases. Thus the wife of the bogatyr Svyatogor offers her love to Ilya of Murom. Ilya is tempted by a beautiful princess Zenira the Most Fair: "She took him by his white hands, kissed his sugar mouth, and bade him enter the palace . . . to feast with her." There she told him not to overeat nor to get drunk for there was more to come. After the feast Zenira led Ilya "to a rich warm chamber, to a bed of yew and ivory, with soft cushions of down," and offered Ilya to lie down next to the wall. But Ilya insisted on occupying the outer edge of the bed none too gently: "Thereupon he seized her by her white breast, and flung her upon the bed of yew and ivory, against the wall."

The above mentioned Marina offers her hand and heart to Dobrynya, saying:

"Thou Dobrynya, Dobrynyushka, son of Nikita,
Take me, Dobrynya, for thy wife."

Upon his refusal and departure, Marina seized her dagger, and hacked Dobrynya's footsteps, flung them into the oven, painted with many devices, and conjured them with a powerful incantation: "Burn, ye footsteps of Dobrynya, burn in this oven of many hues; and may his spirit likewise burn within him for me! As I cut these footsteps, may Dobrynya's dear little heart be torn for me!"

And the charm of the footsteps worked. Dobrynya returned, led Marina three times around the willow bush and called her his wife.

Quite often such a young lady is looking for a bridegroom stronger, more powerful than herself. The future wife of Dunay, Nastasya, being the best marksman in Kiev, starts out into the clear field to marry the man who will be able to conquer her in archery. Nastasya, like a Russian Wilhelm Tell in skirts, shoots with an arrow a ring from the head of her husband, Dunay Ivanovich.

If the object of the woman's passion does not yield voluntarily, the woman, like her contemporaries of the opposite sex, who carry away the brides, kidnaps her bridegroom. For instance, Dobrynya meeting the great Polyanitza, Nastasya Mikulishna, smote her upon her turbulent head with mace of damascened steel. But the warlike virgin sat her good steed firmly, wavering not nor glancing back. After his third unsuccessful attack upon her, Nastasya seized Dobrynya by his yellow curls, pulled him off his horse, dropped him into her deep pouch and carried him away to her house with the intention of making him her husband. At home Nastasya told Dobrynya that she saw him before and liked him. She would grant him his life if he would marry her; in case of refusal she would make a pancake of him. Dobrynya takes an oath that he will take the golden crown with her, i. e., will marry her; reference here being to the crowns held over the heads

of bride and groom during the marriage ceremony. The bylina entitled "One and Forty Pilgrims" depicts the amours of Princess Apraxia, wife of Prince Vladimir, the Bright Sun. "The Princess Apraxia herself led young Kasyan to a fair chamber apart, where stood a couch of smooth boards with bed of down, heavy cushions, and a coverlet of black sables.

"And when all were asleep in the palace, save young Kasyan who was praying, the Princess Apraxia came to him and told him of her love. Young Kasyan recounted to her the great vow which he had taken, and bade her tempt him not, but go thence.

"Nevertheless she came again, and yet the third time; then the good youth seized his stout cudgel and brandished it, and bade her begone, or he would smite her until she fell upon the brick floor. At that she was troubled and went thence; but when Kasyan had fallen into a deep sleep, the Princess crept down from the glazed oven, took his pouch of rich velvet, ripped it open and placed therein the silver bratina (a sort of loving cup which was passed around the table at the beginning of a feast), from which the Prince was wont to drink, on his return from the field; then she sewed up the velvet again so that it might not be perceived."

When Vladimir's messengers overtook the pilgrims and demanded the return of the royal cup, Kasyan ordered every pilgrim to empty his pouch and opened his own. To everybody's amazement and consternation the cup was in his pouch. He told his comrades that he did not steal the cup, that it was Princess Apraxia's vengeance because he had not yielded to her, but he commanded them to respect their own solemn vows and to execute him as a thief.

Shocking as the behavior of Princess Apraxia may seem to us, it was perfectly proper at that time, especially with a husband like Vladimir. According to Nestor's chronicle Vladimir the Saint was extremely dissolute while a heathen.

He had five legal wives, 300 concubines in Vishegorod, 300 in Byelogorod and 200 in Berestov. Besides he ordered peasant women and girls brought to him.

Vladimir gave up his concubines after becoming a Christian, as the legend tells us. The byliny, while making Vladimir one of the chief heroes, do not fail to note his licentiousness. For instance, in the bylina about Danilo the Huntsman and his wife, Vladimir sends Danilo away on an errand from which he will never return, in order to get Danilo's wife, the beautiful Vassilissa, for himself. Vladimir of the byliny is forever feasting, drinking and carousing.

The choice of the bridegroom by the bride and even traces of the capture of the bridegroom still persist in Little Russia. For instance, the putting of a towel around the bridegroom's arm symbolizes the tying of the bridegroom in order to keep him from running away.

When the bridegroom is nearing the bride's gate, the bride's relatives come out with sticks, surround the bridegroom and try to chase him into the yard. The bridegroom lashes his horse and gallops away with his bridesmen. This ceremony is repeated three times, after which the bridegroom is driven into the yard. The bride's mother takes the bridegroom's horse and ties it to a pillar. The bridegroom enters the vestibule where he is met by the bride. The bride's sister or the match-maker gets the ransom for the bridegroom's hat from the bridesmen. This ransom reminds us of the ancient custom mentioned by Herodotus.

If the marriage ceremonies representing the capture of the bride may be taken as proof of the existence of wife-capturing in antiquity, the ceremony of capturing the bridegroom may be taken as a basis for a hypothesis that women were capturing men, though, of course, not so frequently.

Militant, physically strong, not crushed yet by the yoke of the patriarchal system, the Russian woman showed consider-

able freedom in her married life, and resisted desperately the man's despotic advances. Men, of course, did not consider themselves bound in any way even by their legal wives. However, if a man sinned with another man's wife, he thus encroached upon another's rights and was subject to severe punishments, including death. Before the adoption of Christianity and even long after it the dissolution of marriage was very easy for both contracting parties. Women often left their husbands, married other men, or comforted themselves with lovers. If the woman could not free herself from a hated husband, she had recourse to crime—the knife, or poison.

While defending her freedom, the woman at the same time showed remarkable affection and attachment to the beloved husband. She did not want to survive him and was willing to be burned at his funeral, even though at one period she really had no choice, as the burning of the widow was compulsory. According to the early beliefs the wife could not enter Heaven unless she appeared there at the same time with her husband.

The independence which the woman lost in the further development of Russian history was supported not merely by physical force. Like the Germans and the other Slavs, Russians saw in the woman something divine, superhuman; they saw the woman possessed of a weird power, magic charms and a knowledge of nature's secrets. Love is the result of woman's sorcery. The Little Russians believe that a mother may give her child a definite fate by bathing him in certain enchanted herbs.

The magic power of the woman is used not only to arouse passion in the man she loves, but also to punish his infidelity and to remove her rivals, to avenge her injured pride and her ungratified desire. The woman is able to cure people from different diseases and suffering with the aid of some herbs and roots. The woman can explain dreams and omens, help

find lost and stolen objects, prophesy as to the future, bewitch or disenchant in love affairs; she is skilful in obstetrics.

During the following epoch, under the influence of Byzantium and the Asiatic tribes, all these wonderful gifts and professions acquired the evil character of unholy power.

Thus the woman lost the beneficial influence which she exercised in the old days but which can still be traced through numerous beliefs and traditions. Mother Earth, the bountiful provider and protector of humanity, was one of the principal deities. Her chief priestess was a woman who took part in all religious feasts in honor of Mother Earth. The priestess disposed her to be kind to people, stimulated her to fecundity, paralyzed the evil forces inimical to the beneficial power of the Earth. The priestess acted as a loving mother of the people, happy in their happiness, sympathizing with their grief. The reminiscence of such beneficial influence of the woman is still preserved in many places in the ceremony of ploughing round the village as the means of stopping an epidemic on people or cattle. According to the resolution of the village council, a wise old woman, wearing only a nightgown, goes in the night to the outskirts of the village, beats a pan and shrieks wildly. In response to her call women and girls hurry from all sides, with pokers, over-forks, scythes, sickles, hearth-brooms and sticks. All the gates are locked. All the cattle are shut in; every dog is tied. Taking off her nightgown the old woman curses death, while the other women bring a plough to which they harness a naked woman. Then starts the procession of treble ploughing around the village. A Holy Image at the head of the procession is followed by an old woman with loose hair, clad only in a nightgown, riding on a broomstick. Behind her is the naked woman with the plough, and behind the plough is a girl carrying a basket filled with all kinds of grain collected from every house in the village. The girl sows the grain in the furrows. The rest of the crowd dance, and whirl,

making grim faces, swinging their implements in the air, beating wash-basins, pots, oven-doors and scythes, whistling and cracking whips. This weird procession, lighted by torches and bunches of burning straw, stops in front of each house. Women and girls knock on the gates yelling madly: "Beat the scourge, mince the death! Disappear, the deuce take you, black plague! I'll cover you in ploughing, I'll pierce you, I'll rake you up, I'll mince you, I'll sweep you out!" All kinds of spells and incantations are sung. Thus the beneficial influence of the woman found expression in her assisting in the alleviation of various social evils. Like her goddess the Earth, the woman was the symbol of love and peace. Mother love, the original form of all humanitarian feelings, has always been represented as much stronger than father love.

The honor of the ancient Russian woman stood very high. An insult to a woman was punished much more severely than that to a man. Married women were independent economically. They had the right to possess land, and even whole villages. The woman took the man's place during his absence. A widow with children was a full head of the family. Women took part in feasts and men's amusements. Some women also played important part in the social and political life of the country. Most Slavic peoples had very popular, wise women-rulers. The Czechs had Libussa; the Poles, Wanda; the Russians, Olga.

Not one of the early Russian princes was as popular in his time and remembered for centuries with such gratitude as was Olga. According to Nestor's Chronicle, Olga possessed political wisdom which raised her above all her contemporaries. Taking a man's place, Olga did a man's work and did it well. First she cruelly avenged the death of her husband Igor, who had been killed by the Drevliane for demanding heavy taxes. In that she followed the old common law which made vengeance the duty of each and every heir of the deceased. Olga held the reins of government in her own hands. She was the

head of her army, promulgated laws, imposed taxes and tributes, travelled over the country establishing order, and on hunting expeditions. She visited Greece for commercial purposes and was the first Russian to adopt Christianity. She outwitted the Greek Tsar, Constantine, who wanted to marry her. She cleverly persuaded him to be her godfather at her baptism, and thus made it impossible for him to become her husband, according to the Greek Church. Olga did not succeed in spreading Christianity in Russia. Even her own son remained heathen. Yet her great influence on Russian culture is beyond doubt. Later on she was even canonized by the Russian Church. Olga was a typical representative of a free Russian woman.

Due to the equality between men and women, the family ties were on the whole strong in old Russia in spite of polygamy. It would seem that Christianity with its moral and civilizing elements would tend to increase the stability of the family union, which is the cornerstone of the social welfare of the people. It would be natural for the woman to occupy a still better position in society, to become even more independent and to command more respect. But such was not the case. The introduction of Christianity in Russia was one of the most potent factors in bringing about a state of shameful subjection for the Russian woman.

Unfortunately for her people, especially for her women, Russia adopted Christianity from Greece when the Byzantine culture was already in the state of decline and decadence. Greek society was wallowing in luxury and lewdness. The beautiful pure type of the ancient Greek woman was overshadowed by the depraved courtesan. The adventures of some of these women, who had influenced even the Greek emperors, were in many cases so disgusting, their influence so baneful, the morals of the majority of the people so loose, that a strong reaction was unavoidable. Purer and better minds

turned toward asceticism. The shameful mode of life of the average woman helped to create in the minds of those ascetics the image of a sinful, bad wife; woman became a symbol of evil, of moral corruption, disgusting yet greatly tempting even the ascetically inclined men. Greek literature became full of most passionate accusations of women and of vice in general and of propaganda of asceticism as the only salvation. This propaganda coincided with the teachings of the Eastern Church.

Adopting the Byzantine religion, Russia accepted almost entirely also the literature of Byzantium. Both changed the whole order of things in Russia, especially the position of the woman. There was no original corruption nor its reaction of austere asceticism in Russia. Yet all the attacks on women found acceptance in Russian society because the woman was already rapidly losing her independence through the strengthening of the patriarchal system. Russian literature, like "The Bees," "The Golden Chains," etc., based upon and often literally translated from Byzantine works, affected especially the upper class of Russian society, more easily open to that influence, as the only literate class.

Byzantinism permeated ancient Russia with gloom and austerity. With the introduction of Christianity and Byzantine literature Russian society became convinced that there could be no salvation for men living a worldly life and having families. The vow of abstinence and a denunciation of the world came to be considered necessary for every man who wanted to be a real Christian. As it was impossible to turn all men into monks and lock them up in monasteries, each man tried to introduce the monastic life into his own house and to subject his family to the monastic canon. The father, guided by the priest, became the superior. The whole family had to obey him absolutely. He forbade every pleasure and amusement, laughter and discussions; he exacted work and piety. The

same monastic spirit spread to the whole social life. Im-mobility was the ideal of mental and social life. Deadening routine hindered every phase of life. All pleasures and amuse-ments were considered the devil's work, a heathen abomina-tion. Folk songs and folk tales and proverbs were placed in the same category. Games, choral singing and dancing, were cursed and persecuted.

Forbidding every worldly pleasure, denying every free ex-pression of feeling, preaching the mortifying of the flesh, East-ern asceticism set itself especially against everything that had to do with sexual passion. A man could become perfect only through killing his sex instinct. This ascetic doctrine rooted itself so deeply in the popular mind that it led to the forma-tion of a large set of castratoes existing till this day.

"Svyatoslav's Miscellany" translated from the Greek, started the propaganda of the doctrine about the evil in the woman. "The woman who tempted Adam, was the fountain-head of all sin. Don't listen to the evil wife; honey drips from her lips, but it will soon be more bitter than bile and wormwood, and sharper than a double-edged knife. The woman catches the souls of honest men and casts them down to hell. Woman's ways are the ways of hell. You'll find one good man in a thousand men, but there is not one good woman in ten thousand of them. . . . It was a woman who thrust Joseph the Beautiful into the dungeon. It was a woman who suggested suicide to Job. His wife was the cause of Uriah's murder and of the downfall of the most wise David and Solo-mon. A woman blinded the strongest man Samson; she plotted against the life of the prophet Ilya, succeeded in obtaining the head of John the Baptist. The evil woman (wife) is the devil's sharpest tool. Woman committed the first sin, she is the cause of our death. Woman is a trap made by the devil."

The mythical serpent, as he is known, is especially fond of women. He tempts them, lives with them, piles riches on

them, and he does not always take them by force, but often inspires love and they give him their affection voluntarily. The old Nick also has a strong weakness for women. He kidnaps them and forces them to become his mistresses. No good may be expected from a creature who is intimately connected with all kinds of evil spirits.

Thus it came about that even marriage was looked upon as something sinful, and as a concession to the immorality of human nature. Spousal caresses on the eve of holidays, during the Lent, on Wednesdays and Fridays, were considered an unpardonable sin, for which a punishment was to be inflicted not only upon the culprits, but also upon their posterity, their sons becoming thieves and murderers, their daughters, prostitutes, etc. Men and women guilty of such a crime could not enter the church, but had, by remaining outside of it, to confess thus their sin publicly and repent of it.

Woman came to be viewed as such an "unclean" creature that she was not even buried in the same cemetery with men. No man was allowed to enter the room where a woman was confined, until three days had passed and the room had been thoroughly cleaned and purificative prayers said in it. A woman could enter church only six weeks after confinement and after expiatory prayers. In church the women had and still have to stand apart from the men, to the left of the altar. A menstruating woman was "unclean" and not worthy of eating at the same table with men. Even now a menstruating woman is not supposed to enter the church, or touch the cross. She must not be a god-mother, take the oath or do anything which involves touching the cross either with her hands or lips. She ought not to marry because her married life will be very unhappy. She should not even kill a chicken or a duck, because the meat will have a bad taste. She should not bake or make preserves for fear of spoiling them. It is a bad omen if she crosses somebody's road.

In the *Materials on Ukrainian Ethnography* we find a curious Ukrainian legend about menstruation. The Ukrainians believe that women had no menstruation before the birth of Christ. When the Holy Virgin gave birth to Christ she ordered her servant to put her bloody nightgown into water without opening and examining it. The servant could not overcome her curiosity, and for her sin the Holy Virgin punished all women with monthly menstruation.

Witches, like sorcerers, were blamed for all popular calamities, and were dealt with mercilessly. They were executed, drowned and burned alive during each disaster even as late as the XVIIIc. The common people still believe in witches and evil spirits. The author's nurse, a former serf, assured her that she saw a witch with her own eyes and gave a vivid description which coincided exactly with the accepted image of the witch. S. S. Shaskov⁶ says that in 1855 the peasants of Novgorod county buried alive a 70-year-old woman, Malkova, to stop an epidemic of cholera. In 1861 a Russian man from Turukhan sacrificed a girl to the earth.

Byzantinism recognized only women who served its ideals, i.e., remained virgins and became hermitesses and ascetes, like men. Yet even in her self-immolation a woman was not considered as the equal of a man.

Prince Vladimir Monomakh, a man of high ideals and morality, a rare exception among his contemporaries, realized the abnormality of the general order of things and of family life especially. In 1099, he wrote a set of *Instructions* in the form of a will to his sons. In these *Instructions* Vladimir defined the relations between man and God, between a government and its subjects, among people in general, and between husband and wife in particular. He says that of all human relations those of husband and wife are the nearest and the

⁶ *Istoria Russkoy Zhenshchiny*, p. 88.

closest. The Russian Orthodox Church considers husband and wife as one person, and their union is supposed to last until death parts them. Understanding that such a union is impossible without love, Vladimir prescribes to his sons and his subjects to love their wives. Yet even he at the same time advises them not to let the wives have the upper hand, and agrees with the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians about the obedience of the wife to the husband. Vladimir's "*Instructions*" remained to a great extent an empty letter.

Christianity nominally did away with polygamy. The monastic isolation became the basis of family life. The interests of the Church were to be the highest ideals of the family. Yet there was no union between family and Church, i.e., Christian society. As the family had no high social ideals even in the general Christian sense, there was no ground for the development of any idea of morality outside the family circle. The whole life was limited to narrow, egotistic family interests, centering around the head of the family. The very word "woman" is of later origin. In ancient Russia only wives were considered as women, the word "wife"—"zhena" coming from a Sanscrit word meaning "the one giving birth." The females who for some reason or other could not get married were locked up in monasteries as useless creatures.

The powerful influence of the basic elements of the half-Asiatic Byzantine civilization harmonized with the no less powerful influence of the Mongols, with whom the Russians came in contact very early in their history. The Russians mixed less readily with the civilized western nations than with numerous Asiatic tribes. Blending their blood they also made additions to their language, copied customs, manners, traditions, beliefs, and developed and preserved the patriarchal system, under which those Asiatics have lived for centuries and millenniums. The patriarchal family principles enrooted themselves so strongly in Russian, that they hold good even now in

the family and social life of the peasantry, the commonalty, the merchants and the clergy.

The "Tartar Yoke" lasted in Russia for over two hundred years. It destroyed the old social order and introduced many abnormalities with the life of the Russian people. One of them was the unnatural attitude toward the woman, as a despised, unclean creature which ought to be kept in constant subordination. Developing in Russian men the despotic habits of Asiatic heads of families, the Tartars at the same time helped to develop in the Russian women the passiveness which has remained their chief characteristic till the present day. The woman was looked upon as the man's chattel. Not only her body, but her every thought and feeling, her very soul, were her husband's property, and the husband, like his Asiatic models, hurried to lock her up if not in a harem, at least in a terem, resembling the harem in many respects.

The terem was a special addition to the house, either on top or behind the house, far away from the reception rooms. The windows of the terems usually faced either the garden or a fence so high that no strange eye could penetrate it. The husband and the father kept the key to the terem. Even brothers and near relatives could not always gain entrance into the women's rooms.

The woman enjoyed the reputation of being honest only if she lived locked in the terem, and was considered more than immodest if she allowed any strangers to see her face. She could not even go to church as often as she liked. Wives and daughters of the nobility went to church in closed carriages. The wives and daughters of the tsars travelled during the night when going on pilgrimage. When they chanced out in the daytime special attendants carried around them curtains of heavy cloth, to hide them from the eyes of passers-by. Even the physician was not allowed to see his royal patients' faces and had to feel their pulse through some thin cloth.

The degree of the estrangement of a woman from the rest of the living world depended upon the height of her social position. The peasant women knew no *terems* at all. They were too important as an economic factor to part with. Even though they were treated like cattle, and the heaviest work was imposed upon them, they were more or less equal to men, as their work was indispensable. Quite often men sought their wives' advice and judgment. In the city the wife could not play such an important part in her husband's work. The workingman did his work alone; the merchant did not need his wife's assistance; the official certainly could not allow his wife to interfere with his work. In every class of city society the man alone made t' · living. The woman became a housewife in the literal sense of the word. Thus the woman came to be entirely dependent upon her husband economically and despised accordingly. She not only had to spend money according to her husband's tastes and wishes but to obey him in everything. Having lost her influence as an independent member of the family and an important economic factor, the woman lost her value. She became a desirable wife either because of her physical beauty or because of the dowry which her father or brothers could give to her.

The women of the lower classes were more or less free to mingle with men; they appeared at the same table with their fathers' and husbands' guests. The wives of the middle class and of the nobility appeared in the reception rooms only for a short while to serve food and drinks. The higher the woman in the social scale, the more shielded and restrained she was, so that princesses were really the most unfortunate of all the girls. Imprisoned in their *terems*, they were shut off from the whole living world and hardly had any chance to marry. Their marriage with subjects of their father was not to be thought of as it meant disgrace and dishonor. The barrier of religion stood in the way of the marriage of Rus-

sian princesses to some foreign princes. The convent was the only escape from the terem, and these poor creatures were often glad to enter it. Sometimes they were forced there against their wills, together with the tsars' wives who have lost their husband's good graces.

The most important point in the bringing up of the girls of the middle and higher classes was to make them stout, as no girl was considered good looking if she weighed less than 180 pounds. No effort was spared to reach that effect. The girls and women ate the best of food and plenty of it, with hardly any exercise except perspiring in the bath-house to insure good digestion. Their nerves were strong as there was no excitement in the routine of their life. The stories of women pilgrims, gossip, folk tales, songs, endless beliefs and superstitious, fortune-telling and conjuring, and the *Lives of the Saints* for the few literate women of the highest class—that was all that constituted the women's mental and spiritual life.

It is curious that obesity has persisted to be the greatest attraction among the women among the merchant class and the peasantry. A few years ago, during a visit to the Russian Dukhobors in Canada, the author, who is 5 feet 3 inches high, and at that time weighed between 145 and 150 pounds, was told by a Dukhobor: "No insult meant, sister, but really, I am surprised that there was a man fool enough to marry you. A skinny puny little bit of woman like you would not stand a ghost of a chance in finding a husband among the Dukhobors. You ought to see my Mistress (meaning his wife). Why, she can lift you with one hand, like a kitten!"

The most important document describing or rather prescribing the rules for the family life in Russia of XVIc. was the *Domostroy* or rules of the household. It was written by a priest, Sylvester, at one time a favorite of Ivan the Terrible, as priest of the Court church. Like Vladimir Mono-

mach's *Instructions*, the *Domostroy* was written as a set of instructions for Sylvester's son, but it became a veritable code of family and household ethics by which the people lived for a long time, and which in its main features is still followed especially by the merchant class in Russia.

Sylvester depicts the Russian family of XVIc. as a separate independent ideal unit. In it the father, the head of the family, appears as a stern ruler, called the emperor of the house. He really was as much of a ruler in his own family as the Grand Duke of Moscow was in Russia. The tendency of the *Domostroy* is to isolate the family completely from the rest of the world, so that nobody should know what takes place there. The ascetic ideal excludes all social life, and ignores the dictates of common sense and reason and human nature itself. It only demands the salvation of the soul and makes it the duty of the man to save the soul of his children and his wife with the aid of the whip. The wife is not an independent being, equal to her husband in human rights, having her own reason and will, but a miserable creature, incapable of full mental and moral development, having neither ability nor strength ever to become of age, always dependent upon her husband not only in family life, but also in spiritual life. Therefore the wife is placed on an equal footing with the children, and it is the husband's duty to take care of her, to teach her how to live, what to think, what to do and how to get to heaven. The husband is responsible even for his wife's sins and, therefore, it is to his own interest to prevent her from committing too many. The sins of his children and even of his servants are also due to his negligence in their instruction. So "If the husband does not teach his wife, his children, all members of his household, his servants . . . and is not zealous of their souls and his own, he will ruin himself, and his family and everybody else in his house in this life and in the life hereafter." A virtuous husband, father

and master "will get a great crown because he took care not only of himself but led to eternal life all those around him" (Ch. XXXVIII). All suggestions in the *Domostroy* about the education of children have in view exclusively personal or family interests, thus truly reflecting the spirit of the times. In the XVIc. the national self-consciousness of the masses was still entirely undeveloped, due to the complete absence of impressions which usually arouse national feeling in a sociological sense.

Relation between the family and the country is not mentioned at all, as if it did not exist. The *Domostroy* preaches loyal service to the tsar, but for very practical reasons:

"If you serve loyally the earthly tsar and fear him, you learn to fear the heavenly Tsar. The former is temporary; the latter is eternal and is an impartial judge; he will reward each one according to his merits."

The *Domostroy* gives an ideal picture of the family life based on the truths found in ancient literature, customs and traditions formed in the course of two centuries. Fear was the dominant factor. Corporal punishment in all its varieties was an everyday occurrence in all classes of society of the XVIc. Fear was the only motive force in every sphere of life. Even the nobles were loyal and served well from the fear of corporal punishment. The morals of the period found their expression in the proverb: "The master will find a fault if he wants to strike you."

The *Domostroy* has a special chapter on how to bring up children in proper fear of the Lord and of all appropriate punishment (Ch. XV). It says in part:

"And if God gives children, the father and the mother must take care of them and bring them up in the fear of God The mother should teach her daughters handicraft, the father should train his sons in whatever line they have ability. Parents should love their children and save them

through fear—teaching and punishing and reasoning and beating. Punish your children in their youth, and they will comfort you in your old age. . . . If children commit sins through their parents' neglect, the parents will answer for them on the day of the Last Judgment. And if the children sin and do evil because they are not punished by parents, it is the parents' sin. They will be punished for it by God, laughed at by the people; their house will be ruined; the judges will sell them out and shame them; they will suffer grief and privation. God-fearing parents, wise and sensible, bring up their children in fear of God and punishment, teach them knowledge and thrift and handcraft. Those children and their parents are pardoned by God and blessed by clergy, and praised by the people. And if God takes away such children, they are the pure offering of their parents, and pray their parents out of purgatory."

Corporal punishment was the basic educational principle. Fear was the stimulus which was supposed to bring blind obedience as response. This is the *Domostroy* formula of "how to teach the children and save them through fear" (Ch. VII):

"Beat your son in his youth, and he will comfort you in your old age and will give beauty to your soul. And do not weaken in beating the child. Beating with a rod will not kill him, but will make him healthier, for hitting his body you are saving his soul from death. Loving your son, inflict more wounds on him, and you will rejoice afterward. Punish your son in his youth and he will make you happy when he grows up; and you will boast of him among your enemies, and your enemies will envy you. Bring your child up used to denials and you will find in him rest and blessing. Do not smile at him when playing with him; if you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up, will set your soul on edge. And give him no power in youth but crush his ribs while he is growing, because when he is big he will

not obey you, and you will feel annoyed and ill at heart, and your house will be ruined, and your neighbors will reproach you, and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune."

Going into most minute details in its instructions about housekeeping and the shielding of the family from all possible dishonor, the *Domostroy* does not recommend anything except the whip and the rod in bringing up and educating the children. Even the Scriptures are not mentioned as the basis of moral life. Preaching to the fathers that they will get reward on earth and in heaven for punishing their children, the *Domostroy* comforts the children that the time will come when they themselves will become heads of families and fathers, and that for all their present sufferings they will be rewarded by the blind obedience of their own children.

The wife, being placed in the same category with the children, has to yield to the same treatment in the hands of the head of the family, i.e., to be taught, instructed and punished with a whip or rod. While beating his wife for the slightest disobedience, the husband does not even deign to become angry at her; she is too insignificant to arouse her master's wrath. She should have no ill feeling against her husband, but should accept his beatings modestly and patiently, as a just punishment of her lord and master, who is trying to develop some sense in her silly head.

"The husband ought to teach his wife with love and sensible punishment," says the *Domostroy* (Ch. XXXIX), "The wife should ask her husband about all matters of decorum: how to save her soul, how to please the husband and God; how to keep the house in good order. And to obey him in everything. Whatever the husband orders, she must accept lovingly; listen to him with fear and do as he bids. First: have fear of God and keep clean bodily. On getting up say prayers, give out work to all servants . . . The wife should know how to prepare every meal and drink and to teach the

servants. Then she is a good wife and a good housekeeper. And if a good wife of a good husband knows everything through the husband's instruction and punishment, and through her own sense and ability, everything will run smoothly. . . . And she should know every handicraft and teach the servants. . . . And not to set a bad example to the servants, the lady herself should never be idle except in the case of illness, or with her lord's consent. . . . Whether the husband returns or a visitor calls, the lady should be found at work; it is to her credit, as well as her husband's, and the servants should never awaken the lady but should always be awakened by the lady."

"And the wife should consult her husband about everything all the time and remember what is needed (Ch. XXXIV). To visit and receive only persons chosen by her husband. And when there is company, to keep away from drink: a drunken husband is bad, but a drunken wife in public is an outrage. And to talk to the visitors about handicraft and household management. . . . If the callers talk about nice things: how good wives live and obey their husbands and teach their children, listen to them and ask them politely about anything that is not clear. But if the visitors are gossiping or asking about wrong things the wife should tell them: 'I do not know and did not hear anything. I do not gossip about princesses, boyars' wives or my neighbors.'

"The wife should not eat and drink secretly from her husband (Ch. XXXVI). She should not ask her friends for food or drink or anything without her husband's permission, neither should she keep secretly anything that does not belong to her. She should get her husband's, not her servant's, advice in everything."

"A good housekeeper should keep order and teach servants and children by kind word and by punishment: if a word is not sufficient—strike them. (Ch. XXXVIII). And if the husband finds that his wife or servants do not keep everything

in order, or the way he wants the things done, he should reason with her and instruct her. If she obeys, he should love her and be good to her. If she does not obey, or does not know everything herself and teach the servants properly, then the husband should punish his wife and fill her with fear, and having punished her, forgive her and talk to her, and punish her with love. And the husband should not get angry at his wife, and she should have no ill feeling against the husband; they should always live in full sincerity. . . . And if the wife is not afraid of the punishment and does not follow the instructions, the husband should beat her, not in front of the people, but privately. . . . And neither wife nor husband should feel badly about it. And no matter how guilty the wife is, the husband should not hit her eyes or ears, nor beat her with his fist or feet under the heart; nor strike her with his staff or with anything made of iron or wood; whoever beats that way in his wrath or grief—causes much trouble; blindness and deafness, broken hands and feet, headache and toothache, injury to the unborn child if the woman is pregnant. But to beat carefully, with a whip, is sensible, painful, fear-inspiring and healthy. . . . In case of a grave offense, pull off her shirt and whip politely, holding her by the hands and saying: 'Don't be angry; the people should not know or hear about it; there should be no complaints.' "

Modesty was demanded from a woman above all things. There was a curious rule in ancient Russia, according to which an old lady visiting was handed a glass of wine openly, but the young visitors had theirs given to them secretly, while they were called out of the room. It was done in order to avoid the shame and reproaches from evil people. It is interesting that the chief reason for a woman's modesty was the desire to avoid the gossip of the evil-minded. It was not the modesty of a self-respecting person, but the modesty of a weakling who is afraid to spoil her reputation, who is mak-

ing every effort to appear modest. Such really was the Russian woman of the higher classes. She had no power, no independence. She was her husband's housekeeper, not taking any part in her husband's work; she was only taking care of his property. She depended upon him economically and he considered himself far above her and made her his obedient tool.

The *Domostroy* hardly touches on any phase of life outside of the family circle; its main instruction is that the strangers, the outsiders, should have no reason for defamation of character of any member of the family. Blind obedience to every wish and whim of the head of the family is all that is demanded from the wife and children. The father and husband has to be careful not to cripple his wife and children in his zealous "teaching." The only inherent restraint in the husband's wrath and cruelty was supposed to proceed from his devoutness and his fear of God, his desire to save his own soul. In reality, in the majority of cases, this factor was absent, and the fate of the whole family depended upon the unrestrained arbitrariness of the head of the family. He could even get rid of his wife forever by forcing her to enter a convent. This gave him freedom to remarry. There was no external restraining power.

Not only the *Domostroy*, but all the literary productions of lesser influence, depict family life in the darkest colors: the extreme despotism of the head of the family; the position of woman equal to that of a slave; the education of the children based on constant punishment and pardon—these are its chief characteristics. However, the family described by old Russian literature is really not Russian family in general, but the family of the higher classes.

The Ecclesiastical Council created by the order of Tsar Ivan the Terrible, called general attention to the fact that many husbands got rid of their wives and married several times. It tried to control this, by allowing only three legal marriages.

The first marriage was the real one; the second and third were without the nuptial benediction and with a church penance, like temporary excommunication.

The fourth marriage was called "swinish life" and brought with it exclusion from Holy Communion for eighteen years.⁷

Ivan the Terrible did not intend this decree for himself and far surpassed the indicated number of marriages. According to the historian, Peterey,⁸ "In dissoluteness and voluptuousness Ivan the Terrible surpassed everybody. He often raped the most eminent women and girls and then returned them to their husbands and parents. If they showed any signs of repulsion, he, after raping them sent them home and ordered to have them hung naked over the tables at which their husbands and parents were eating; the latter did not dare to have their meals served anywhere else, if they did not want to lose their life in a similar way. The corpses hung there until the husbands and relatives succeeded in obtaining permission to bury them. He always exchanged lovers with his son Ivan. Once Ivan's mistress complained to him that she was the laughingstock of many women. Ivan told it to his father. Ivan the Terrible became so furious, that he decided to kill every woman and girl in Moscow. Although princes, boyars and favorites managed to prevent the wholesale murder, he ordered several hundred women and girls to be brought into the Kremlin. They had to undress completely in front of the Tsar's family and courtiers, and walk in deep snow, in the bitter cold. Some of them he had flogged to death and their corpses thrown to the bears. The Terrible Tsar and his satraps loved such scenes which excited their weakened sensuality. During his travelling in the country, from city to city, he ordered all the women and girls whom he met, to undress and stand naked in the snow until he passed with all his suite. . . . Before his

⁷ *Stoglav*, Ch. 23-24.

⁸ Shashkov, *Istoria Russkoy Zhenshchiny*, pp. 167-8.

death, when he was literally disintegrating from diseases which resulted from his licentious life, he took a fancy to rape his daughter-in-law, Irene. In response to her cries and sobs came many courtiers and servants. Ivan let Irene alone but executed all the witnesses of that scene. All these and many other violences of the Terrible were not the only example in our history!"

The Tsar's example was naturally followed by his subjects. Such conditions were pernicious for the woman, the family and the whole society. Locked up in the terem, deprived of all rights, the woman grew dull mentally; she lost the sense of human dignity and grew weak morally. At the same time the family lost its significance. Marriage, lowered to the level of a mere bargain, could not any longer remain a union based on mutual love and respect. It became the despotism of rude force on the one hand and slavery on the other. Heavy was the loss to society because, expelled from it, the woman took away with her the gentleness and purity which are contributed to it by a woman who is a man's equal, friend and not chattel. The heaviest of all was the blow to the whole sphere of education, the only sphere left more or less to the woman. Grown crude, ignorant, a slave legally and a slave in her soul, she could not be a good guide for her children; she could bring up only slaves.

Among the boyars the mother had hardly anything more to do with her children than giving them birth. The children passed at once into the hands of wet-nurses, nurses and a whole army of servants, later on of teachers. In the middle classes the mother assisted in the education of her daughters; the sons were under the control of the father and those appointed by him. The father's power over the children was so absolute that the following proverb came into existence: "It is my child, if I want, I eat it with gruel or drink it with milk." The education system which prescribed extreme se-

verity with children formed an impenetrable wall between parents and children. Children filled with fear of their parents did not learn to love and respect them. The whole scheme of family and social life developed the utmost insincerity, hypocrisy and falseness.

It is a well-known fact that a person soon becomes corrupted when his natural impulses are crushed. The isolation and despotic order of Russian family life in the XVIth and XVIIc. made impossible the development of any high moral and social ideals. There were many cases of rebellion and breaking away from the family. Not only sons but daughters and wives tried to break the unbearable yoke of slavery. In disturbed times women acted like men and with equal success. Of course, they were fewer in number but they were equal to the men in their constant effort to free themselves and take part in the social life. No restrictions and limitations could kill the social instinct. The *Domostroy* and the terem not only did not guard the morals of family life, but on the contrary brought about greater immorality.

Women who were not strong enough to break the family ties by running away committed either suicide or acts of violence characteristic of slaves, namely: arson, poison, political denunciation. The latter was especially popular because the woman knew that it would take a long time for the court to find out and decide who was right and who was wrong, and meanwhile she would be free. Even the horrible punishment for the killing of the husband could not stop the woman from this act. The guilty woman was buried alive in a standing position, with her head above ground and remained there until her death without food or drink.

Brought up in the patriarchal atmosphere, imbued with the idea that she is predestined exclusively to family life, the woman first of all strove toward a free use of those faculties which the adherents of the patriarchal system see her only

preëminence. Slavery and imprisonment led the women to incredible depravity, by which she avenged herself upon her lord and master and destroyed the archaic family order which enslaved her. Lewdness and depravity were characteristic not only of the women who could be bought and sold or taken by force: it penetrated everywhere; it allured also the terem inhabitants of the highest classes. They led a depraved life not for the sake of money or because they were forced to it, but simply for their own pleasure, thus trying to sweeten the bitterness of their terem life by the joy of free love with any men whom they liked.

Men were also not satisfied with the existing order of family life. Marrying not according to their own desire and free will, but under compulsion from their parents, they found it hard to live with wives whom they did not love and who did not care for them. Naturally in such cases irritability and discontent led to frequent quarrels. Caresses of hated or at best not loved wives did not satisfy the husbands. They craved for other women and changed their lovers very often. The dissoluteness of men increased to such an extent that many of them lost any taste for women and had recourse to sodomy and even worse. And this license left its imprint on every phase of social life. Even the clergy, secular and monastic alike, showed at times the influence of these unhealthy conditions.

License led to infanticide, which always raged among the Russian Orthodox, produced by the usual factors, namely: poverty, shame, or fear of shame of the unmarried mother, also by anxiety about the future of illegitimate children who, under Byzantinism and the patriarchal system, were doomed to lead most miserable and unfortunate lives. Infanticide among several religious sects was so common that in some sects it even became a religious duty. Some leaders of the Feodosyeyevtsy and the Runners approved of it openly, preaching

that a secret sin will be judged secretly, and that the murdered infants being holy will by their prayers in heaven save the sinful souls of their parents. Infanticide was punished by a horrible death but as usual all punishments remained futile before the evil created by the false system of family and social life. Corpses of infants were often thrown into the privies. The depravity of all classes was accompanied by its inevitable follower—syphilis.

Thus man undermined with one hand the structure of family life which he was trying to uphold with the other. All-pervading paternalism, deadening despotism, the enslavement of mind and feelings—all this could not kill in human beings the natural desire for freedom and joys of life. Not finding any proper outlet, these desires broke out in the form of most horrible vices. The preachers and followers of the *Domostroy*, evidently, did not suspect that the instincts and impulses which they sought to crush so mercilessly would find their way out and flood the country with a filthy stream of family crimes, dissipation and syphilis.

The Code of the Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich eloquently supported the descriptions of the Russian family life in the Russian and foreign literature of that time. The Code carefully places the family under the protection of the law. It guards widows and orphans from poverty by defining with precision their property rights and their stipends from the State. It does not recognize the fourth marriage: "If anybody steals—marries the fourth wife and has children by her, that wife and her children are not entitled to any property after his death." This law, of course, tried to stop the men from what was called "Swinish life" by the Ecclesiastical Council. The Code tried to support the falling morality of family life by a series of cruel punishments for each of the common crimes. However, it did not treat all members of the family with equal justice, showing much more leniency toward

men. For instance, for killing or poisoning her husband the woman was to be buried alive mercilessly, in spite of all the pleadings of her children and relatives, whereas the husband was not subject to the same punishment for the same crime. His crime came under the same category with any murder.

Merciless execution awaited the son or the daughter for killing father or mother, but either parent guilty of the same crime was not to be executed, but only imprisoned for one year, after which he or she was supposed to come to church for a public confession of sin. Parents had the right to complain against their children and demand support from them, but the complaining children were flogged and then were returned to their parents by force. The Code had severe punishment for the dishonor of the wife or daughter and for efforts to introduce temptation and corruption into another man's family. Yet even the fear of severe punishments could not prevent the Russians from yielding to temptation, especially when there appeared in Moscow a model of a different life. The so-called German Village, populated by foreigners, with its free and happy life, attracted not only the youth but even the older generation of the higher classes. Russian society had nothing but debauchery; in the German Village one could get an idea of the European good society, of social life. Of course matters of personal appearance attracted the Moscow inhabitants first of all. Many boyars and sons of the nobility began to copy the German styles of dress. Even Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich, who at the beginning strictly adhered to the rules of the terem life and forbade all kinds of popular amusements, games, songs and dances as the devil's fun, later on yielded to his second wife, Natalia Kirilovna, who loved a gay life. Foreign amusements were introduced into the Tsar's own terem.

Toward the end of the XVIIc. the old patriarchal system was shattered so hopelessly that even some of its best

and staunchest supporters came to realize the necessity of radical reforms. Strict isolation of the sexes began to weaken. To women was gradually restored their right of appearing in men's company at the feast and to entertain in their own homes. In some parts of Russia, as in Novgorod, women freed themselves even earlier and took such an active part in the life of the country that when Ivan the Terrible conquered the Novgorod Republic in the XVIc., he deemed it necessary to make the women take an oath of loyalty together with the men.

The corrupting influence of the terem life found a specially strong example in the tsar's family after the death of Alexey Mikhailovich, when the family had lost its head. His place was taken by his elder son, but the whole family, while recognizing him as the tsar, could not accept him as father with unlimited power over all of them. On the other hand, there was the widow of the tsar Alexey, whom, by law and conscience, the children had to obey absolutely. Yet she was the mother of the two youngest children and the stepmother of the older children already grown up. They would not recognize her as mother and remain in full obedience to her, as the family laws demanded. Here was a wide field for intrigues. The sickly tsar without the authority of a father could not keep all the members of the family in proper relations. The elder princesses, not restrained by a father's authority, flatly refused to recognize not only the laws of the terem but even the laws of decency. They yielded on the one hand to the demands of their physical nature, and on the other hand became fired with ambitious aspirations of political character. After the death of the eldest brother, the most intelligent and the most passionate of the princesses, Sophia, wanted to become the head of the family and even aspired to the tsar's throne.

Princess Sophia was the best example of how deep the Russian women could sink in moral depravity and how des-

perately savage they might have become if Peter's reforms did not hasten their liberation from the terem. Sophia did not stop at anything to attain her goal. She reached the throne but could not hold it in spite of her cleverness and energy. Without any political education she was too conservative and short-sighted. She stood for the preservation of the old Byzantine order at the time when rapprochement with Europe became an urgent necessity. Her desperate fight was soon lost. Her no less ambitious but much stronger brother Peter locked her up in a convent whence there was no escape for her.

At the end of the XVIIc. even the church interfered with the arbitrary power of the head of the family in the question of the marriage of the children. In 1693 Patriarch Adrian issued the following proclamation: "The priests performing the marriage ceremony do not consider properly the consent of the bridegroom and the bride. They often marry persons who do not love each other and whose subsequent life therefore remains miserable, quarrelsome, unhappy and childless. Therefore the holy Patriarch orders that from now on the priests should question the couples whether they enter the holy state of matrimony voluntarily or by force. And if the woman, especially the girl, is too bashful, question her parents and relatives, especially her mother. And if the girl does not answer the priest's question but shows her aversion for the bridegroom by some sign, like spitting or shaking her head, such couples should not be married until they express their consent."

But in the masses of the Russian people the family despotism remained in full force for a long time, supported by serfdom which introduced into the peasant family the additional despotism of the landlord, i.e., complete demoralization.

On the whole, as the historian Kostomarow⁹ puts it, "The Russian mode of life in XVI and XVIIc. represented a combination of extremes, a mixture of the simplicity and fresh-

⁹ "Ocheruc domashney zhizni i nrayov velikorusskago naroda."

ness of a primitive people with the Asiatic love of luxury and Byzantine weakness." The first, of course, were the characteristics of the masses, the latter those of the higher classes. However, adds the historian, human nature was the same in all classes, and he depicts this nature in very unattractive terms.

II

THE POST-PETRINE LIFE

STRONG governmental influence was felt in the Russian family life from the very beginning of the XVIIIc. One of the very first orders of the tsar Peter the Great was somewhat of an extension of the proclamation of Patriarch Adrian. The patriarch had forbidden priests to perform the marriage ceremony against the will of the bridegroom or the bride. The tsar wanted to give the prospective husband and wife a chance to get better acquainted with each other before the marriage, to study each other's character and tastes. For that purpose he established in 1702 the rite of betrothal six weeks before the marriage ceremony. During this period the bridegroom and the bride were to be allowed to meet every day in the presence of their parents, if not alone. If they found that they did not suit each other in some respect, they could part without any obligation on either side. This new measure, one of the results of the western influence on Peter, tended to decrease the number of unhappy marriages. It strongly appealed to the young people and enhanced their sympathy for western culture, but the older generation, naturally, could not at once renounce the old custom of letting the bride and the bridegroom see each other for the first time only at the wedding ceremony.

Peter himself suffered a good deal from the old terem system. His first marriage to a girl brought up in a terem was very unhappy. He had no common interests with his wife. She could not understand him nor sympathize with his

modern plans and ambitions. She wanted to continue the mode of life to which she had been accustomed and to bring up her son in the old traditions. Convinced at last that she could not bring up the heir to the throne according to his principles, Peter got rid of her. Modern as Peter was in his ideas, he did not disdain the recourse to the old method of getting rid of an undesirable wife, namely, by locking her up in a convent. It was easy enough for him to do that, but he had to pay a dear price for the clash of old and new ideas in his family. Separation from the old-fashioned mother did not make the son a follower of his modern father. Prince Alexey was a staunch supporter of the old order of things, and this so exasperated Peter that he feared lest his son destroy his work, and to prevent this he killed his son with his own hands. The family life of the tsar could not serve as a good example for his subjects.

At the same time the Russian family, as an institution, suffered from the intrusion of governmental authority. Fathers were forced to sacrifice their parental rights to the interests of the reformed government which wanted to train its servants according to the new principles. By the tsar's order boys of nine or ten years of age were taken away from their parents and placed in governmental boarding schools where they were given special training. In 1713 one hundred children of the nobility were thus recruited for an engineering school. The children of officials and of the clergy were also thus placed in schools. The new school with its harsh masters armed with rods and all kinds of contrivances for punishment, hardened the hearts of little boys torn away from their parents. Many boys ran away from schools; many were hidden by their parents in spite of the severe penalties.

This compulsory education away from home influence, which the government considered essential for its future officials and military leaders, aroused strong opposition on the

part of the parents because it meant a weakening of the family ties between fathers and sons and a disintegration of the family. Nevertheless forcibly freed from the responsibility of bringing up and educating their children, the parents gradually became accustomed to rely entirely upon the government and did not concern themselves much with the education of the children of pre-school age. The physical well-being of children was their only care.

Peter made a very successful attempt to spread culture among the Russian nobility, yet it was a very difficult task. The young noblemen whom Peter sent abroad to study the foreign industrial and military systems, returned considerably changed, but in most cases that change was quite superficial. As soon as they found themselves in the old environment they lost their acquired cultured manners, grew beards, donned the old-fashioned Russian garbs and defied all punishments and fines.

While there can be no doubt that the pre-Petrine Russian society of the XVIIc., was getting ready to fall under the influence of European civilization, it is just as certain that in the XVIIIc., under its veneer of civilization it remained true to its roots, and retained in its ideas and morals the imprint of the age, its crudeness, obscurantism and Asiaticism together with the good characteristics of patriarchal antiquity. Hard as Peter tried to enlighten the young people, to develop their capacity for independent thinking, to awaken their sleepy brains by establishing schools and including sciences in their school programs, the first post-Petrine generation was, according to Peter, "full of senseless, foolish heads," dull headed and slow in taking up sciences. The second post-Petrine generation was more alert mentally; yet it slavishly followed Western authorities and sources, and was weak, inconsistent and self-contradictory. Only the third generation, which he did not live to see, might have satisfied him more or less.

The basic reforms of the beginning of the XVIIIc. and the comparative enlightenment which followed them naturally had a strong influence on the family life and on the position of the woman in the family and in society generally. Following the example of Western Europe, Peter the Great decided, by liberating the women from the terem, to make them members of society, break the isolation of the individual families, create collective interests and develop more normal social life. This good intention almost defeated itself because of the peculiar manner in which it was carried out.

Peter the Great brought the women out of the isolated terems directly into the noisy court entertainments, balls and assemblies, threw them into the company of drunken, dissipated men and forced them to take part in the grossest amusements. For instance, at a feast in honor of Peter's son, at the tsar's table were served two enormous cakes, each containing a naked dwarf. The naked female dwarf addressed the men and the naked male dwarf made a speech to the women.¹

Such an abrupt change from the isolated terem life to the free social life caught the average Russian woman unawares. Accustomed to the life of an anchorite and a slave, stupefied and ignorant, with all her ideas and ideals limited by the narrow frames of the *Domostroy*, the woman had no opportunity for acquiring mental and moral strength which could guarantee her that independence and stability of character, which was so necessary in her new social environment with its manifold temptations. The tsar's decree could not, like a touch of a magic wand, transform the terem woman into an equal member of society, or rather into a society lioness, free and proud, conscious of the power of her charms. Under the threats of fines and punishment the freed woman entered the new society. Timid and embarrassed, dressed in strange Ger-

¹ "Zapiski Vebera," *Russki Arkhiv*, 1872 No. 7 and 8, p. 1370.

man clothes, the woman did not know how to behave, what to do and what to say.

It was the tsar's order to learn European dancing that helped the woman to find her place in society. She soon formulated an ideal of social life, around which were grouped all the other interests of her life and which overshadowed everything else. External splendor, luxury, beauty in the European style became her idea of true education. The whole family life and the education of the children became adapted to this idea. The mother herself was unable to meet the new educational requirements and had to seek the assistance of foreign governesses.

The social education of the young generation consisted mainly of the learning of foreign languages and of good manners. And the latter was no easy task as the Russian gentleman had to learn a great deal. He had to be taught how to behave at the table, how to use knife and fork, how to stand, to sit, to bow, to carry on a conversation, not to annoy his neighbors with his nose, mouth, hands and feet, how to use his handkerchief, what to do with his hat, etc., etc. Thus the reformed Russian family became most concerned about the worldly pleasures and fashions, acquired a false idea of education and surrendered to the governmental authority its own parental authority over the sons. Of course, the above described type of family was at first to be found among the courtiers and the highest nobility, but spread into all classes of society, which also were forced to change their mode of life. In many parts of the country more or less removed from the center, the old patriarchal system prevailed, but about the middle of the XVIIIc. the numerous exiles of noblemen to Siberia brought about a law, according to which the wives of exiled men were free to renounce their husbands, to remarry, to enter convents, or simply to continue to live on their estates, as the exiled were likened to the dead.

The term "nobility" or aristocracy in the European or English sense might perhaps be applied to some of the old families claiming descent from Rurik or the old independent feudal princes but this descent gave them no privileged position in the formal life of the Russian governmental machine. They had steadily lost political significance since the development of Moscow as the predominant state of Russia. They had been replaced by a new serving nobility and this was stereotyped by Peter's Table of Rank. Each rank gave certain rights and privileges, material well-being and esteem.

The Russian "nobles" were not even allowed to sign their proper name in their communications with the tsar. Even Catherine II, who was called the "Tzaritsa of the Nobility," and who gave the nobles many rights and privileges, took many occasions to remind the Russian aristocracy that the titles, position, estates and honor showered upon them by her could not in any way protect them from her arbitrariness, and that it was as much in her power to raise any one from the lowest to the highest position, as to reduce to nothing even the highest official among her subjects. They were only "Your Majesty's Slaves," never sure of their position, subject to all kinds of tortures and even public flogging. Being whipped themselves physically and morally, the nobles flogged mercilessly their peasants. Not having any self-respect, they could not respect others.

The whole family became interested in the rank of its head, especially the women, because the father's or husband's rank gave them certain titles, a reserved place at the official festivities, a certain number of horses for their carriages, etc. All this was bound to arouse a special sort of ambition, the so-called officials' ambition, the pettiest of all. This curious ambition did not mean the protection of common interests which is supposed to be the duty of officials, but a constant effort to draw out for themselves all that their position made

possible. Feeling his complete dependency upon the persons in power, the official could not develop his sense of honor; his chief need was to adapt himself to circumstances. He became servile before the people above him and arrogant to those below him. Benefactors were those who could open up careers. Reverence toward such benefactors was taught by fathers to sons. Thus the Table of Rank did not bring the desired results; it did anything but awaken the consciousness of common or government interests. The officials came to the conclusion that only God ought to be served disinterestedly, but that service rendered to the tsar ought to be partly for glory and partly for self-enrichment. It was considered advisable to make the appearance of serving exclusively the good of the country; yet those who served were of the opinion that they had to make their merits known and boldly seek the reward, because the bashful ones left their service empty-handed.

The desirability of a position was defined not by the actual salary but by the possibilities which it opened for taking bribes. Honest officials were very few in numbers, and their honesty did not help matters, because their secretaries and others were on the lookout for bribes. Children learned from their fathers the art of getting rich quickly. Military service was not quite as profitable, but most of the officers came from landowners' families. The serfdom which had been growing was finally standardized. The governmental lands which had been given in use to the officials only during their actual service, now became their own estates. The peasants also became their property. When in the second half of the XVIIIc. the landlords received the right to leave the governmental service and to live on their estates, they came into much closer contact with their serfs. It was then that serfdom revealed the strength of its depraving influence.

Having thus examined the foundations which formed the family in reformed Russia, one cannot wonder at the fact

that it could not bring up real citizens, that it was helpless morally and depended upon chance. On the one hand, the old basic family traditions and customs were cast away; on the other, the new form of marriage often proved to be a failure because legislation still adhered to the Code of Tsar Alexey. While it was preached that love was a necessary moral condition in marriage, it was at the same time asserted that the young people had to accept their elders' choice because love is blind and treacherous. The wife was represented as friend and assistant, not a slave; yet the husband was to remain the head of the family and not to fall under her influence. The change from *terem* to society life did not increase the woman's virtue. There was no real society, there was no popular opinion, no popular judgment. Each family after all continued to live its own individual life. Numerous biographies depict the then existing conditions.

During the reign of Elizabeth and Peter III, dissipation, flattery and the humoring of the ruler, every imaginable luxury, debauchery and drunkenness constituted the characteristics of court life, and from there spread among the other classes. The Russian gentlemen of the XVIIIc. was proud of his depravity and boasted of being a worshipper of all graces, of making husbands wear the horns and seducing wives of all nations.

Loose morals gave the tone to the whole social life. Tagging after women, family quarrels on account of infidelity, elopements, kidnapping of girls, scandals caused by jealousy—all this was preoccupying the minds of the people. Love affairs in the higher spheres were so much more interesting because they were responsible for many a turn of the governmental system. The struggle for favor was so stubborn and so complicated that at the first glance it was easy to take it for the struggle of political parties.

Luxury and dissoluteness under Catherine II spread from

the court into all classes. The number of illegal children was so great that the government could not help but take notice of it. Peter the Great founded a "hospital" for children born out of wedlock, and decreed that the killing of illegitimate children was to be punished by execution. Catherine the Great substituted for the term "illegal" the term "unfortunately born infant" and proclaimed that the acknowledgment of illegitimate children should not be considered disgraceful. She realized that family morals suffered a good deal from poor legislation, especially concerning divorce. Serious plans and really humane ideas were mixed in Catherine's legislation with decrees which revealed surprising narrow-mindedness and were evidently nothing more than utopias.

At the beginning of her reign Catherine II decided to increase the influence of the government on the family, which had proved its incompetence in the question of education. Catherine and her assistant, Bietsky, worked out a plan, according to which the children were to be taken away from their parents at the age of five and remain in school until the age of eighteen or twenty. The children were to be allowed to see their parents and relatives at certain times, always in the presence of teachers. According to this plan reforms were introduced in the schools for boys, and schools were opened for girls of the nobility with special departments for girls of the other classes who were to be trained as servants to the nobility. The first years of the child's life were not considered in the educational system. It was supposed that during that period the child is nothing but a little animal whose brain is not open to any training.

Catherine had a grandiose idea of bringing up a new generation, not contaminated by the superstitions, prejudices and vices of their families, which would in its turn bring up its own children in the spirit of its own education. Naturally such an idea was only a product of the passionate enthusiasm of two

people, which expressed, however, the extreme desire of the government to penetrate into every phase of life, a logical tendency originated by Peter the Great. But this idea could never be realized for the simple reason that its execution began with breaking all family ties for the children of very tender age, and this meant the weakening of family affection. The educational program, based mostly on Locke's theory which stressed the normal development of children, demanded expert instructors who were able to appeal to the little hearts and guide their pupils with love and care. Of course it was impossible to find suitable instructors. It was necessary to accept the ones from whose very influence the empress wanted to save the children.

Foreign instructors had to be employed. The influence of these foreign instructors was especially strong at the end of XVIIIc. and at the beginning of XIXc., when the French emigrants began to come to Russia in large numbers, offering their educational services. These emigrants were not like the former ignorant French tutors and governesses. They were mostly of the French nobility, well educated and violent antagonists of republican ideas. The Russian nobility were satisfied to have such instructors for their children, since they did not realize that the foreign education would make out of their children anything but Russians. Cosmopolitanism remained for a long time the chief characteristic of an educated person in Russia. Even the Russian language came to be looked down upon as fit only for giving orders to servants and subordinates. This system of education not only did not develop strength of character, but, on the contrary, crushed or spoiled and hardened character, especially in the boys' schools.

The whole XVIIIc. was characterized by the inconsistency between intention and fulfillment, between the adopted project, scale and program for the education of the growing generation.

and the practical results of this education. A single whim of the ruler was sufficient to establish in Russia a whole system of various schools and institutions of learning from the elementary schools to the highest universities and even academies of science, even though there were no native scientists and extremely few educated people. Vain were the protests of the parents whose function was, practically speaking, limited to the actual bearing of children and of feeding them for a few years. The family was rapidly losing its moral force and ideals and was becoming a mere nest for breeding.

The only thing which saved some children from being torn away from their families was the insufficient number of schools. Girls had not been sent to school before Catherine's time. The preference of boys over girls constituted a dominating governmental principle toward the family from time immemorial. It was based on the helplessness and subjugation of the woman's personality to that of the man. The daughter, from the patriarchal viewpoint, was not only useless and lost to the family after her marriage, unable to continue the family name, but she was an actual burden on her parents who had the difficult task of finding her a suitable husband.

The education of the girl of the XVIIIc. was a curious mixture of the old patriarchal tendencies and the new, mostly French, ideas. As before, the utmost care was given to the children in order to keep them strong and fat. Servants recruited among the serfs were to take care of that. From them the children learned something about the Russian people, its folk-lore and also its superstitions. The nurses were often much nearer to the children than the mothers, who were too busy with their social duties, dresses, balls and love affairs. As Western culture gave Russia at first only external models of dress and of mode of life, the education and the whole upbringing was directed accordingly. The spiritual nature of the girl was totally ignored. It was unnecessary in that so-

ciety based on the ideas and morals of the higher society of France. All serious interests were absent. Love was the highest and, practically, the only interest of the girl of that period. At the age of twelve or thirteen the girl was considered old enough to be married.

Unprepared for family life, these girls usually made poor mothers and still poorer housekeepers. Some of them became reconciled to the rude prose of married life; others, under the influence of their environment, vied with their husbands in the number of their amorous adventures. Often the spouses of intractable temper parted and each considered himself free from all family responsibilities.

Catherine's permission to the noblemen to give up governmental service and to settle with their families on their estates brought about even fuller moral decadence of the family life based on serfdom. Each well-to-do landowner moving to the country even temporarily, surrounded himself with every comfort and luxury of the city life including amusements. They turned their brightest serfs into actors and dancers, poets, composers and scientists, and used bond-servants to develop the liberal arts. Becoming musicians and artists at the masters' will, the serfs often found themselves in the role of tutors and educators or simply men-nurses of their young masters. In case of need or for punishment these professional entertainers were sent to work in the fields. The actresses were mostly the landlords' mistresses. The peasant women and girls also became lawful prey of their masters, even though it was against the law for a nobleman to live with base-born women.

While the landowners were glad of a chance to leave the service, their greatest ambition was to see their sons in the general's rank. Mothers were aspiring either to military glory or to the acquisition of many serfs for their sons. The means of attaining either did not concern them. Many rich people

anxious to give their children a brilliant education employed not merely foreigners, but even Jesuits who proselyted whole families into Catholicism.

Kavelin, a Russian historian, thus characterized the original process of development of education in Russia: "The development of culture was purely external; instead of self-activity, passive assumption of the foreign."² Real accomplishment was possible only by a long and gradual process of growth.

Even during the reign of Catherine the natural desire of the educated high-minded individuals for real social activities, not satisfied with dry and mostly deadening formality of official service, found its expression in joining the Masonic clubs and organizing philanthropic circles. They intended to direct the social forces toward better education, general enlightenment and the amelioration of conditions among the masses. It was their ideal to develop coöperation between the school and the family and to improve family life. But the official supporters of the existing state of affairs considered the activity of the reformers as pernicious and even threatening to shatter the throne itself. Instead of utilizing this living force in the interests of the government and the people, the officials crushed it so mercilessly that there were few persons desiring to continue their reforming activities. Special scientific circles were the only ones permitted to live, but they, naturally, could not attract many members, nor could they have any significance in the history of the family and of the social ideals.

Russian reality could not satisfy young men with alert, inquisitive minds, people who sought live and fruitful activity. Not finding it in the life of the so-called society, they were not able to reconcile themselves to its ideals and to accept

² K. D. Kavelin, *Mysli i Zamietki o Russkoi Istorii*. *Viestnik Evropy*, 1866, II, pp. 359.

its opinions. They began to feel its emptiness and made futile efforts to fill it. Conscious of their helplessness, unable to introduce higher ideals into the society or to find any useful social work, many of the best men of that period became despondent, came to consider themselves superfluous and even committed suicide.

Russian liberalism of that time consisted chiefly in a protest against serfdom and against the administrative arbitrariness and all the evils which followed them. But while the Russian people were getting ready to adopt the liberal views, the young protestants were too hasty in proclaiming their political significance. As is well known, they met with a very sad fate. Then came a new epoch of the historic development of the Russian family. Declaring the family utterly incapable of bringing up the children according to governmental principles, the authorities during the reign of the Tsar Alexander I greatly increased the number of institutions of the crown, especially military and girls' boarding schools for the children of the nobility. Under the next ruler special attention was paid to the so-called "gymnasia" for girls and boys. In all larger cities in connection with these gymnasia there were opened boarding schools in which children for a very small sum of money were given board and training for some special governmental position. It was a strong inducement for the parents. The education of the children above ten cost them hardly anything and opened a career for them, especially in military schools. As a result parents began to bring their children to those centers from every corner of Russia.

This fact cannot be omitted in connection with the history of the Russian family. It certainly was responsible for its further disintegration by loosening the moral and spiritual ties between parents and children. The family was losing its rôle of the educator of its children. It was not responsible for the bringing up of the future members of society, and

therefore, not interested in methods in education. It rightly thought that there was no use in trying to do anything in this direction because whatever they did, the school would change without consulting them. The children were kept at home until the age of ten in the environment of serfdom and under the care of serfs, and then they entered the schools of the crown and lost the last ties with their parents.

During this period there was much excellent educational work proposed by distinguished scholars and the current of educational theory had been guided by the idealistic reforms of Catherine the Great. At the same time the benefits of this study had been applied to some of the higher educational institutions but as a whole educational practice had not kept pace with ideas. In the vast majority of governmental schools and even in the universities, little attention was paid to the actual execution of advanced pedagogical theories.

The ideal aim of these schools was to bring up men permeated with the strictest sense of subordination, submissive to the authorities, blindly executing every order. The best means for reaching such an aim was considered the discipline of the barracks and the military drill, and the best "educators" were, of course, military men who were used to disciplining soldiers but did not have the slightest idea about the child's nature and very vague ideas of morality. The ideal instructor never showed any indulgence to the children, wanted them to be perfect from the very first schooldays and knew how to intimidate and depersonalize his little victims. The ideal pupil was the one who incontestably allowed his elders to crush his nature and turn him into a machine, the one who studied diligently without ever thinking about the subjects taught. Numerous memoirs of former pupils of such schools depict the terrible conditions existing there. Yet these schools trained excellent officers, landlords, police officials. They could hold their subordinates in most wonderful discipline but

proved utterly worthless as military men, as officials, landlords, and fathers, whenever they had to act on their own initiative, using their own common sense, or to exercise moral influence on the young people. Then they complained that they never learned anything like that in schools, that they never had to act on their own initiative, that they understand only the influence of threats, fear and corporal punishment. Thus was brought up a whole generation who had for their wives a generation of girls brought up in girls' boarding schools or "institutes."

The so-called institutes for girls were opened to bring up a new generation of women, outside of the crude influences of the ignorant family and corrupted society. Catherine the Great, the originator of this project, did not take into consideration the impossibility of preparing workers for unknown environment, without forming any moral and spiritual ties with that environment. The institutes succeeded pretty well in giving the girls the appearance of refinement, developed in them better taste, made their demands more numerous and increased their impressionability; but they did not give the girls any serious scientific training, did not develop their character and guarded them from acquiring knowledge of life and people. The girls grew up in an artificial little world of their own, where everything was presented in a false light, and where ignorance reigned about the most common subjects and relations. The product of such education naturally was pitiful, weak, broken at the slightest harsh contact with life. "Institutka"—the student of an institute, became subject to anecdotes. Even children mocked at her naïveté, at her pathological estrangement from the realities of life, at the aimlessness and uselessness of her education.

All this is true, but just the same the graduates of those "institutes" had a beneficial influence on the society as a whole. Rude, ignorant society received in its midst dozens of girls

whose education, one-sided as it was, gave them new interests and ideals, much purer and more cultured than those of the people about them. In the epoch of serfdom compulsory military service, pettifoggers and "cantonists" (Jewish boys taken away by force, baptized and brought up as soldiers), in the epoch of violence and servility, in the families of ignorant landlords and petty bureaucrats, appeared young ladies, unfamiliar with all those evils, not contaminated by prevailing vices, open to noble impulses, which lifted their thoughts and feelings high above the filthy and vicious reality. It is true that these young ladies were not fit for the struggle with the harsh realities of life; yet their very presence in that society was in itself sort of a protest against the existing conditions, and had a beneficial effect. Individuals were either crushed or adapted themselves to their environment; but their place was taken by others. Those who married and became mothers passed their cultural instincts and interests to their children and thus imperceptibly and gradually fulfilling their civilizing mission they were changing the society which was making a laughingstock of them.

It is easy to imagine the tragic position of the "institutka." In the official's family she met with a deadening stagnation of ideas, hypocrisy, and venality; on the landlord's estate in most cases she had to face licentiousness of manners, insipidness of social entertainments, servility of servants, scenes of violence, barbarism and the crushing of human personality. Of course, there were exceptions, but very few. The parents, considering the choice of her future husband as their duty, hurried to marry the "institutka" off as soon as possible. They only smiled at the personal taste and desires of the bride-to-be, finding them, not without good reasons, to be impractical and inapplicable to reality. The energy of the "institutka" fell; her character became spoiled; strange surroundings became

familiar and natural, changing her own nature, or else painful collisions took place.

Having married she found herself even worse off, because she ceased to be an involuntary witness and became more or less responsible for the conditions in her own family. An extorting and cavilling official, a dissipating landlord abhorred by his serfs, an army officer flogging his soldiers to death—such was her husband to whom she was tied by most intimate interests, relations and duties.

One of the most interesting outcomes of the unbearable conditions in which the educated Russian woman of the thirties and forties found herself, was George Sandism. It was the first significant change in the moral life of the idealistically inclined Russian woman. The George Sandist was mocked at and thrown a slur upon as much and more than her predecessor, the "institutka." Society could not forgive her exaltedness, her romanticism, and especially her open love and admiration of the man of her own choice.

George Sand, her personality and ideas, had an enormous influence on the women of Russia. She was the first one to demand emancipation and freedom of sentiment, to protest openly against the social and family order existing in the thirties and forties. George Sand's propaganda of freedom of sentiment and her sceptical analysis of formal duty was bound to attract irresistibly the women in a country where the educated minority suffered from total spiritual isolation from the half cultured masses; where incessant conflict was going on between old traditions and new ideas, where the strength was on the side of prejudices which had enrooted themselves from time immemorial. George Sandism, with its new valuation of people—according to their personal qualities, the greater or lesser fineness of their spiritual nature, the elevation of their thoughts and emotions, their ability to love

and follow the dictates of their heart—was new and detrimental to a society where people were valued by their official position and riches. It is easy to imagine how George Sand's novels appealed to the Russian woman whose education had awakened in her instincts which were incompatible with the crude reality.

The Russian George Sandist of the forties and fifties was a type of woman who considers love as the aim of her whole existence and the only way out of harsh reality. In that latter condition lies her main social significance. She wanted to love freely first of all, and her choice coincided with the cultural movement of that period. The object of her choice often proved unworthy of her sacrifice, but anyhow he was a man of the new type, with new ideas and interests, which was drawing society out of its state of stagnation. In spite of his shortcomings he was nobler, more cultured and humane than the masses. George Sand's idea of freedom of choice took root in Russia before any of her other ideas. Nevertheless dense ignorance and an Asiatic despotic society based on serfdom, were responsible for the undesirable results which the pure idea of freedom of sentiment brought about as soon as it began to be acclimated. A revolution took place in Russian ideas and morals. Old traditions were cast away. At the end of the fifties it was decided that everything old was no good; therefore the old-fashioned women were also no good any more. To seduce a girl, to allure a married woman for the sake of a momentary whim, to establish a liaison with some seamstress or maid and to leave her when she becomes wearisome—all this passed for the practical applications of George Sand's principles. Licentiousness became fashionable for men. Ladies, who under the strict patriarchal rule were obliged to wear the mask of virtue, now threw it off and did not remain far behind the men when an eccentric mode of

life became not only fashionable but even gave the reputation of cleverness and modernity.

However, the rapprochement between Russian society and Western Europe played a very important role in the true emancipation of the Russian woman and helped her to become an equal and useful member of society. On the whole, the drastic reforms of Peter the Great carried along with them a basic change in the history of the Russian woman. Olga was the only woman ruler in pre-Petrine time. After the death of Peter the Russian throne was occupied for three quarters of a century almost exclusively by women, which goes to show the change of attitude toward woman in general and the recognition of her abilities even in such an important and responsible work as the government of the country.

The Empresses Anna Ivanovna and Elizavieta Petrovna were Russian not only in blood but in character and in their whole mental attitudes. It is rather curious that these two rulers revealed the character not of the new post-Petrine woman, but that of the old Moscow type. That was reflected not only in their private life but in their governmental system, i.e., in the manners and the ways of governing the country. They behaved exactly like the landed proprietresses, using their power with the same patriarchal simplicity with which they had ruled their estates in the XVIIc. The only difference was in the size of the estate and in the character of the subjects. The empresses considered Russia as their estate and likened their power to that of a landed proprietress over her serfs. This may be easily proven by historical data. It is remarkable that even the Empress Catherine I and Catherine II, both not Russian by blood or education, perfectly adopted the same patriarchal attitude toward the Imperial power and showed themselves in every respect as Russian landed proprietresses. Catherine II especially enjoyed that

role, even though she really was a ruler of the European type. In intimate conversations with her subjects she liked to call herself just the mistress of a little estate.

This phenomenon may be explained not only by personal characteristics of the women rulers of Russia, but by the very important circumstance that the practice of having women on the throne was entirely new to Russia, and that Russian life had not developed as yet the type of the woman ruler, woman-empress. But Russia had a ready, well-developed type of the mistress of the estate. This type was very familiar and appealed to the people. Hence the natural identification of this type and the empress, especially as neither Anna and Elizabeth nor Catherine I stood out of the ranks of ordinary women, and did not receive any special training for the position which they later occupied.

Empress Anna, a niece of Peter the Great, was put on the throne in 1730 by a powerful group of courtiers who wished to introduce in Russia the English form of government. They made her sign a whole list of demands which made her a mere figurehead. She had to agree to the following:

1. The country is to be ruled by a Supreme Council consisting of eight members.
2. The Empress has no right to marry or to appoint her successor.
3. The Empress cannot declare war or sign peace at her own discretion.
4. The Empress cannot promote anyone above the rank of colonel.
5. The guards and the whole army are entirely under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council.
6. The Empress cannot give away estates belonging to the government, nor has she right to use the money of the crown.

7. The Empress must not employ either Russians or foreigners in any capacity without the approval of the Supreme Council.

8. The Empress cannot take away any privileges from the nobility without a lawful reason for it.

9. The Empress has no right to impose new taxes.

10. The Empress must agree to everything which will improve the welfare of the people.

Anna accepted those demands and undertook to consider herself dethroned if she violated them. She was crowned as an empress with limited power, but just one week later, supported by a part of the nobility and the army, she convoked the Supreme Council, ordered to have brought to her all the papers which she had signed, and tearing them up proclaimed herself an absolute autocrat.

Empress Anna, according to Prince Shcherbatov,³ "did not have a brilliant mind, but plenty of that common sense which is preferable to the brilliancy of mind. Very obdurate by nature, she quarreled with her mother and was even cursed by the latter, as I know from a letter kept in the archives of Peter the Great. In her answer to Peter, Catherine is forgiving her daughter Anna. Her gross nature was not softened either by education or by the way of life of that century, for she was born in the age of churlishness in Russia. She was educated and lived at the time when violence was often used, and this taught her not to spare the blood of her subjects. She signed without any hesitation orders for most cruel tortures and executions at the request of her favorite, Biron.

"Having no desire for glory she introduced very few new laws and institutions, but made great efforts to preserve the old ones. She was, sufficiently for a woman, attentive to her affairs and liked to keep them in good order. She never undertook anything in a hurry, without the advice of her most

³ Melgunov, P. E., *Russki Byt*, p. 312.

skilful statesmen, therefore all her decrees are clear and well grounded. She enjoyed luxury, but to a degree suitable to the general welfare of the country. Empress Anna's rule was strict, at times tyrannical—but the people were ruled fairly well and were not overtaxed. The new laws were formulated clearly and executed minutely.

"A Special Cabinet was established, where everybody was equal and expressed his opinions freely, venturing to contradict even the Empress herself, who never tried to press her point but was always seeking the truth."

Catherine I was a model housekeeper. In her receipt book for 1723-1725 she not only marked her income and expenditures but also her household occupations. One day she visited her truck-garden and received flowers, cucumbers and fruit from the gardeners. Then she visited stables to look over the horses and carriages. She went to see the puppies in the dog house. Sometimes she appeared in the kitchen and cooked with her own hands. She was interested in the details of keeping in good condition the furniture, the silver, the wardrobe room, etc. But she showed her creative ability best in the way she constructed and decorated her summer residence as a surprise for her husband. Peter was so delighted with it that he called his first day there one of the best days of his life. This summer residence later became the Tsarskoye Selo.

Not one of the Russian empresses could be compared with Catherine II in the light of her mental development and administrative ability. Catherine rendered an immortal service in the field of education of the Russian people and in that of strengthening the independent position of the woman.

In the field of house economy, very intricate on the old Russian estates, the woman had always been complete mistress. This branch of activity was hers by the force of tradition. Even the *Domostroy* did not dispute her rights and her abilities in this direction. Besides, not only the tradition

but the law was not against the increasing of her activity and her rights in the domain of rural economy. It equalized her rights with the rights of men to possess land and serfs, to manage them at her discretion, to buy and to sell estates. In a word, in this respect the woman enjoyed equal civil rights with the man, and was ahead of the European woman in her legal status.

The landed proprietress in the full sense of the word, businesslike, practical, sometimes even too energetically holding in her hands the reins of control and keeping her family and peasants in severe subordination was quite a common type.

In the capital, in the higher society, this type gave place to the lady of the hot-house type, the product of French education. There the whole circle of her activity was limited to her boudoir, parlor and ball room, where it was her vocation to display her charms, her good manners, her fashionable dresses and her dilettante aesthetic talents. This category of women belonged exclusively to the "Society." They not only were not interested in the household activities in their own homes and estates but looked upon them with aversion and proud contempt as base, and fit only for serfs.

The landed proprietresses often vied with the men around them of the same class. Because of their greater ignorance and conservatism the women often even surpassed the men in severity, waywardness and cruelty toward their peasants.

There is no doubt that the economic role of these women had a beneficial effect on the development of the woman's character. Management of estates, household responsibilities, commerce and industry, all this was helping to create strong types of women. There were some who engaged in commerce, attended the fairs, established brandy-distilleries, took part in races and hunting and sometimes even became military leaders by forming their peasants into troops to repel bands of robbers.

Where a woman was not an independent proprietress she had charge of the "women's half," which consisted of the whole army of dressmakers, seamstresses, lacemakers, spinners, weavers, hairdressers and the numerous staff of female servants. The lady of the house had to be an expert in getting supplies of provisions and in controlling the kitchen and the table service. The quantities and variety of food supplies stored on a good estate were enormous, but eating was as much a joy to Russia as drinking.

Almost a slave in all other spheres, a weakling, inactive, designed for the humiliating role of a man's toy, the woman was able to display the real strength of her character and her abilities, her creative genius, only in the sphere of rural house economy. The type of a proprietress independent and active must be considered as the generic prototype of the new, modern type of the Russian woman—a human being and a citizen.

Catherine II was practically the only real woman writer in Russia of her time. She spent a good deal of her time in literary work, but was not always original and often needed to have her works corrected because she did not know the Russian language well enough. She encouraged writers and poets as long as they did not overstep prescribed political limits. She punished them severely when they fell under the influence of the liberal ideas of France. Catherine's assistant, Princess Dashkov, received an excellent European education and was the first woman president of an Academy of Sciences.

Throughout the XVIII and XIXc. there was quite a number of women who tried their hand at literature and even at science, but they did it not as professionals, but as dilettantes. They were wealthy ladies, well educated, well read, often even talented, with sincere love for literature, science and art, but they engaged in these occupations solely for their own amusement, entertainment or out of vanity; they had no system, no serious aims, no consciousness of social duty. That was why

the results of their work were so insignificant, and the question of professional education aroused such mockery and opposition. The women lacked just that element of professionalism which, while adapting itself to the social demands, creates higher social ideals. The stage was accepted as a diversion. The ballet was most becoming to the salon of the society lady. She could take part in it herself and display her grace and charms before her guests. The ballet was also the favorite art on the rich estates, where the ballet dancers were recruited among the serf girls. Yet the theatre was for a long time the only real field for independent intellectual work for a woman. The actress was a whole century ahead of the woman writer, woman physician, etc.

There was no theatre in Russia during the early Moscow period. Theatrical performances were banished and persecuted as the devil's trick to ruin Christian souls, but they gradually won favor with the authorities. The artistic profession opened for the Russian woman with the beginning of the Russian theatre. Many actresses appeared in the Imperial Theatres and won glory, wealth and respect, but it must be remembered that all early professional actresses were representatives of the lower, often of the serf class. They knew nothing besides their repertoires. There is something characteristic and fatal in the fact that while in the newly reformed Russia exclusively the privileged classes took part in the court life and in every sphere of governmental activity, and the nobility was first in everything, science and art became the domain of the lower classes, often even of serfs or children of serfs.

Lomonosov, Tredyakovsky, Pososhkov, Volkov, Dmitryevsky and others were all children of peasants and burgesses. The nobility produced hardly a single scientist or artist of importance during this period. Professional occupations were considered below the nobleman's dignity. When Glinka accepted the chair in the University of Dorpat, it was commented

upon by the magazine "Viestnik Evropy" in 1803 as a very unusual and significant event—the first example of a nobleman joining the class of professional men.

While the noble families were suffering steady demoralization, new families sprang up, which, thanks to the "Table of Ranks," were put on the same footing with the nobility. Their progenitors came mostly from the provinces and belonging to the clergy were brought up under different influences. Most of them were graduates of ecclesiastical seminaries. Those seminaries were naturally even worse than the schools for the nobility. The curriculum was very narrow, the teaching dry and lifeless, corporal punishment the basic pedagogical method. The punishments were often utterly senseless and cruel. Many students ran away and were engaged as tutors on landlords' estates. Many of them got married during vacations so as not to return to school. This was prohibited in 1753. The students who were able to go through those schools, away from their parents and all family influences, under the care of severe school masters who considered themselves born pedagogues not needing pedagogical training, came out with strong and persevering characters. They made good officials and often reached quite high positions.

Almost all officials owned land. Even the petty officials used all means to save up and buy themselves some. They usually bought the estates in their wives' names, so as to be sure not to lose them in case they were discharged for excessive extortion and knavery. The ideal of a petty official was to marry a landowner's daughter and receive an estate as dowry. He thus would become a landlord of an estate no matter how small, and could boast before his less fortunate colleagues that he was going to spend the holidays in "his country home."

These officials married early. They were expected to be married at twenty and at forty to become dignified heads of large families. Due to the lack of common social interests and amusements, drinking became the favorite pastime and the chief characteristic of the home life of officials. Children imitated their fathers. The fathers were apt to be severe with the children and the mothers were too weak-willed and shielded the children from the father's punishment. Both had a very bad effect on the children's character.

The ideas of a suitable education were adopted from the nobility. Society ideals predominated here also, but due to the lack of means their realization often led to comical results and caricature. The French language and dancing were first on the program. Grammar, arithmetic, geography and other subjects, which could not be displayed in public, occupied a subordinate place and were even considered unnecessary. The children of the petty officials were taught mostly by the runaway students of the ecclesiastical seminaries as the cheapest teachers obtainable; they did not know French themselves but taught it to the children, because the parents were not able to control them in any way.

The great majority of the people did not go beyond the rudiments of mere literacy. The new family cast away the old tradition to secure official nobility; they imitated the higher classes, but did not assimilate any principles, and brought up their children in idleness, without any spiritual authority, without any moral principles. The family had no share in the mental development of the children and served as poor examples morally. Of course, such a family atmosphere could not develop affection and confidence in the children. Young and alert minds were often wandering, not being trained for independent thinking. Following the line of least resistance, the youths were ready to accept anything which freed them

from moral responsibility. Family influence being negative, the young people easily came to denounce everything that their parents were accustomed to respect.

Strange as it may seem, the people were interested in reading at that time, and there were quite a number of books published in Russia, especially translations from French and German. The best read individuals wishing to rise above the crowd, began to denounce whatever was respected heretofore and to blaspheme everything held holy by the older generations. A system of negation with anihilistic tint became very fashionable, and the most stubborn and bold abnegators were hallowed by the young people. They became veritable idols, embodying simultaneously the tsar, the parents, the teacher and the friend. Their influence was amazing. They were chosen as father-confessors; to them the young people came for guidance and orders. They were imitated in their every move. Their words and their opinions were holy. They seemed to be wiser, kinder, stronger than anybody else—in one word, they were perfection itself, always surrounded by crowds of admirers and followers. Unfortunately those idols did not always use their influence properly and, instead of leading, sadly misled their trustful disciples. Such was the type of the new generation educated without family ideals, in the schools of the crown, under the general state regulations which took the place of pedagogy and psychology. The government seemed to be pleased with the results of its efforts. Everything seemed to be in good order. Russia boasted of her political and military strength. The very first serious conflict with Europe revealed her blindness and delusion. All forms of life which united the people into a true society proved void of inner tenor. It became evident that a living society, able to understand and to defend the interests of their country, needed besides the dead form something which develops higher moral and social ideals, which inculcates the idea of service different from that of the

governmental service as common to the officials of that time. In other words, sad reality revealed the fact that there was no true society in Russia, but only a general public which gathered together to attend some entertainments under the surveillance and protection of the police and which was dumfounded at the sudden explosion brought about by the Crimean War.

Russian women owed their elementary education to their German Empress, Catherine II. For their political education they were indebted to another German Empress, Maria Fedorovna, the wife of Paul and mother of Alexander I and Nicholas I. Empress Maria Fedorovna, former princess of Würtemberg, was German by blood, character, temperament and habits; French by education, and cosmopolitan by her moral and philosophic views, she was well able to appreciate the lack of family virtues in Russia, since she suffered from it in her own family life. She was forced for a long time to receive and treat as her friends the lovers of her husband, and she finally gave her consent for Paul's murder in 1801. This woman, undoubtedly very talented and strong-willed, hated and despised the institutes for girls established by Catherine. She considered them too empty and showy to have serious influence, and established the so-called "Smolny Institute" for girls of the nobility. This new institution became a real laboratory for feminine monarchical ecstasy, to bring up the future generation of ladies of the house and mothers saturated with patriotism and grateful adoration for the autocracy. Numerous memoirs of the students of that institute breathe of fanaticism and almost worship of the throne and reigning family. Thus the chief aim of the Empress, namely, to unite the growing female generation into a league of monarchists devoted heart and soul to the dynasty of her sons, was realized with unrivaled success.

The error of Maria Fedorovna, which spoiled the results

of her pedagogical plans, lay in her insufficient acquaintance with the Russian nobility. She did not foresee the fatal abyss which the brilliant institute education would create between her spiritual daughters and the average noble family to which they would have to return. She did not take into consideration the deep and gloomy ignorance of the serf-owning Russia. Hundreds of girls who received an idealistic and sentimental European education in a shielded institution, were thrown into a barbaric, half-literate, libertine, drunken, cruel society which at its very best roused their indignation by its organic incompatibility with the kind feelings and wise rules unalterably impressed upon them by the institute teachings.

By inspiring her wards with virtues inapplicable to the Russian world of the day, the Empress Maria unconsciously prepared the final ruin of the noble family. Disappointment, disillusionment, moral suffering were accumulating suitable material for the coming sixties, impressing recruits of despondency into the future army of woman's emancipation.

Every despotic school has the misfortune of being a laboratory for political tendency. The famous motto of Nicholas that the government must not be either reproved nor approved was, from the standpoint of autocracy, very judicious, logically correct and practical. Turning the students of the Institute into fanatical supporters of autocracy and Orthodoxy, Maria Fedorovna and her followers unconsciously infringed upon their own motto. They were inoculating the Russian girls with definite political views and what was still worse, helping them to develop a desire and a habit of taking an interest in politics. Of course, the political views of the students of the Institute were in favor of the existing order, but where there are views, there is criticism and desire for activity. Collisions with the harsh Russian reality sharpened the critical process in hundreds of young, tender-hearted, idealistic girls.

False gods were cast away; new ones took their place.

The decade of the fifties showed that having renounced the artificial political ideal, the Russian girls had developed in themselves a capacity, want and readiness for social work, and an enormous static energy for future political activity.

Discordant agitation got hold of both the educated and the half-literate masses in the fifties. Everything got mixed up; one overlapped the other and spread in all directions. Old ideals and old heroes were discarded. Everything old, even the ideas of woman's beauty and charm, became a synonym of ugliness and undesirability. The new type of womanly beauty was the "thinking" beauty, consisting of bobbed hair, slovenliness, and an appearance of independence. "Emancipation" became the watchword. It meant primarily the equalization of men's and women's rights for illicit connections. This really was nothing new; only in the XVIIIc. the depravity was secret and more or less censured, while the "emancipated" women led a depraved life openly, with the sanction of the nihilistically inclined part of society.

Yet this was only a temporary evil. A new epoch was approaching. Groups of students which constituted themselves apart from the general society of the forties and the fifties, came to the front. They were the very cream of the young Russian generation. Well educated, intelligent and idealistic, they penetrated to the root of the evil in the life of Russia and realized what moral bases were necessary for her free development and strengthening. At the head of this group was the young Emperor Alexander II, educated by the great humanist and idealist, the poet Zhukovsky. Broadminded and humane by nature, Alexander was able to imbibe the idealistic teachings of his tutor in spite of the unsuitable atmosphere which surrounded him.

The abolition of serfdom put Russia socially on a new basis. Old forms of life began to disappear. It was but natural that such a change could not take place without a hard struggle.

The old institutions were transformed; new fields of activity were open; new people occupied the social arena. But the masses could not be transformed over night. Brought up in the old tendencies which they had been led to regard as the only true ones, as the dogmas in their political and civil life; always blindly executing the orders of the authorities, considering themselves men of strict rules and therefore moral, they felt lost at first and could not find any means of self-defense. All around them they heard passionate denunciations of every form of the old life. Critical thought was forcibly kept down too long; humiliation before triumphant adversaries was too strong for the people to be able calmly to analyze the phenomena of either the old or the new systems.

In such an atmosphere the new generation was growing in the schools and returning to their homes, but they were coming back with different ideas. It is true that the school did not give them very much knowledge and did not even train them in logical thinking, but the students readily learned what they could from the magazines, from private meetings, and from conversations. They tried to develop in themselves a hatred for everything old, as branded by serfdom, servility, obsequiousness and injustice. At the same time the old authorities were losing their significance. They came to be looked upon with distrust and suspicion. The young generation was anxious to live according to the new bases introduced into Russian life; they tried to work out new forms of life and in their boundless enthusiasm counted only on their strength. Yet they were not prepared for the new activity—neither by their bringing up nor by education. They were not familiar even with the history of their own country. They did not know the past and had no torch which could throw light on the future. This generation presumptuously undertook a work beyond their strength. They soon discovered that they had no foundation under their feet and in most cases found them-

selves in a false position, just as the older members of their own families.

The family lost its authority when it gave all responsibility for the education of their children. There was no common ground between parents and children. Affection and confidence had no place. Some of the fathers even lost faith in themselves, in their ability to guide the younger generation; others, hardened in their old ideas, flatly refused to yield to the demands of the new era; some felt as if they were guilty before the youths and gave them full freedom; and there were some who could not understand what the children could have against them and with perfect naïveté expressed ideas which were shocking to the young people with their new ideals. An occurrence unknown in history therefore took place in Russia. In many families a gulf was formed between parents and children. And this phenomenon was all the more dramatic because there was no open rupture, expressing itself in fights and quarrels, as it happened in the case of a clash over money or property. Only a spiritual rupture was felt which caused great suffering to both parties. It is clear that neither the family nor the school was to be blamed for such an abnormal state of affairs. The spirit of the time was responsible for it.

The sixties changed the Russian woman. She became quite democratic, much more realistic, prosaic, and acquired practical tact, but she lost a good deal of elegance and womanliness. Emancipation now meant the approach of the woman to the man, the mastering by the woman of everything that was considered the domain of man and which supported the cultural and moral inequality. The women felt that in the field of education they had to follow in the footsteps of the men, that they had to take up the sciences—and, at that, the most realistic sciences, because realism reigned supreme. Whole masses of girls and young women started out for professional schools—medical, pedagogical, stenographic. Women attended

lectures at the universities, so long as it was permitted, and all kinds of scientific and literary readings. They engaged young teachers and students as tutors in mathematics, physiology, philosophy, political economy and various other subjects which hitherto had been considered as the least appropriate for women. Some women ventured even abroad and entered foreign universities, especially that of Zurich.

There appeared a class of "students" whose love of knowledge was concentrated not so much on lectures and books as on friendly relations with young men, and for whom a joint seat in the laboratory was a special interest because it often led to a joint room in some furnished-room house. There were learned realists whom science attracted just as far as it was a material science, which gave them an opportunity for dissecting human corpses and for discussing physiological functions and laws. Then came "kursistki" (students attending courses), and the manner in which they entered the temple of learning made one often believe that they mistook its door for another. Altogether, the ardor for higher education was at first confused with the general muddled stream of life and was one of the many expressions of radicalism in the sixties. The type of "kursistka" represents something more independent, though based on the same tendency. The "courses" attracted great numbers of girls and young women from all over Russia, especially from remote corners. The variety of "kursistki" was truly amazing. There were modest young girls who, encouraged by their good school work in the gymnasium, were anxious to continue their education. There were austere daughters of the poor who looked at education as means of earning better livelihood. Well-to-do young ladies were satisfying their curiosity, sure that they would continue their usual mode of life in the college and remain the same "young ladies" as ever. Numbers of girls utterly indifferent to every science entered the "courses" (college) at the urging

of their mothers who, for some reason or other became ambitious to have "educated" daughters. Those yielded to their mothers, assured that "now" the higher education was really necessary for girls because it would help them to occupy better positions in society. Girls and women of the conventional type, with strong herding instinct, considered it their duty to be in the crowd of students, in colleges, where the most "progressive" women were gathered. The majority of students, however, were the runaways from all over Russia who sought refuge from their husbands, ponderous fathers and ill-natured mothers, who were tired of their monotonous existence and who had no prospects whatsoever in their remote homes. This last variety of girl students is really the most interesting one. It is the product of social and family discord, of the struggle of personal liberty with the formal order of life and the formal morals, the continuation of the same phenomenon which created the George Sandists in the preceding epoch.

Social opinion, the opinion of the serious and from the bourgeois standpoint correctly judging people, criticized the "kursistki" very severely. It was impossible to accept the tendency of the "Higher Courses" in Petersburg as normal. Undoubtedly brought to life by the sincere desire for learning among women, the "courses" by the force of circumstances changed their nature almost wholly. They had to satisfy a different want, not educational but social. They became a sort of corrective for an external evil; they began to answer a demand which was not educational and which expressed itself in society much stronger than the scientific aspirations.

Women played a colossal role in the Russian revolution. To quote A. Amfiteatrov ⁴ "After the political downfall of the nobility in the sixties, after the abolition of serfdom, the life of the Russian woman, which remained unnoticed, became evident everywhere, in every point of life. It proved to be just

⁴ *Zhenshchina v Obshchestvennikh Dvizheniyakh Rossii*, p. 30.

as full of loud protest, just as anxious to find the way out of darkness into the light, just as opposed to violence and antiquity and longing for freedom, knowledge and independent activity. Making summaries of the reign of the Tsar Nicholas, competent observers were astonished to find that about one-third of the 7000 serfs exiled to Siberia at their masters' will, were women. In 1819 women led the Cossacks who revolted in Chuguyev. Twenty-nine of those leaders were flogged, and not one of them begged for mercy. When one of the men leaders was flogged to death, his old mother brought her grandsons to their father's corpse and said in the presence of the generals—hangmen:

"Look, boys, learn from your father how to die for your community!"

During the revolt in Sebastopol in 1830, 375 women were sentenced to death. They led and carried their children with them on their way to execution.

The revolt of the Novgorod military settlers was also inspired by the women. Women constituted 25 per cent of cases of disobedience to the landlords' will, which were brought to the court. The powerful spirit of freedom always appealed to the hearts of Russian women of all social classes, and once the Russian woman started out to defend some outraged rights, she left the man far behind by her energy and the steadfastness of her holy fanaticism.

To study and to become free was an elemental feminine stream which embarrassed by its wave even those who were bringing it to life. The George Sandists of the forties faded into the background when the Russian women began to work for their emancipation resolutely and seriously.

Freedom of work and community homes for the women who shook off their dependence on husbands and fathers, aroused general wrath, and whole volumes of calumny and denunciation. The family stood firm on its foundation and was

not going to cede its rights. Scores of girls, wishing to free themselves from family oppression, contracted fictitious marriages with men of the same convictions, receiving from their husbands separate passport right after their wedding, and thus gained full freedom of action. At the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies the fictitious marriage became almost a common practice among the Russian intellectuals. It was most often resorted to by girls who were anxious to obtain a passport to go abroad, to study at Zurich, Paris, or Heidelberg. The political trials of the seventies revealed dozens of fictitious husbands and wives. The "trial of 50" (1877) is very interesting in this respect, since it showed how often fictitious marriage proved to be the favorite and the most reliable tool for purposes far from matrimonial.

Later on, many fictitious marriages became very real misfortunes for both parties to the contract. There were husbands who, violating the principles of ideal brotherhood, insolently enslaved their nominal wives, legally asserting their marital claims. There were wives who, growing older or becoming ill, got tired of active life and unceremoniously made of themselves a burden on their nominal husband's shoulders. But there were many cases where fictitious marriages became marriages in fact, and sometimes very happy ones, as a result of mutual respect and love. There were also cases of fictitious marriages lasting for many years, in which both husband and wife strictly observed friendly relations and absolute freedom in every respect.

The Russian society of the first half of the XIXc. admitted the "gymnasium" (high school) education for women, but was still against the higher education, considering it not only an unnecessary luxury but actually a most harmful innovation. All higher education, especially medical, was combated for forty years with zeal deserving a better aim. Of course, there were in Russia quite a number of broadminded

and educated fathers and mothers who realized that it was much more desirable for their daughters to get medical education and become economically independent than to be a burden on the shoulders of their husbands whom they neither loved nor respected. But those parents were numerically but a drop in a bucket. It is well-nigh impossible to imagine what suffering and hard struggle with prejudice-ridden parents and relatives the Russian pioneers of woman's independence had to undergo. The refusal of the quiet life in the family circle and the spurning of advantageous marriages for the sake of a long journey to some unknown country (the foreign universities) seemed abominable to the majority of parents and society. On all sides ominous predictions were heard. Even some scientists and university professors expressed scientific reasons (anatomical, physiological, ethical and civic), why those unexpected and unnatural inclinations were detrimental to the family, to the country and to the innovators themselves. The Russian women who were studying in Europe in the second half of the XIXc. were likened to prostitutes and accused of studying medicine and midwifery with the special aim of producing abortions.

The Russian women students had many enemies and very few allies. But those who received their education abroad came out of this trial with such a glory that the movement in favor of medical education for women and of higher education in general soon found strong support among the best part of the Russian society, and gradually led to the opening of schools for midwives, "Higher courses," and at last in 1897, of the first medical college for women in Petersburg. Unfortunately it was entirely too small for all the women who were anxious to enter it, and that led to many new tragedies. It is easy to understand what this meant for a woman who, after having sacrificed her best family and friendship relations to obtain a higher education, was told there was no room

for her. Many of those rejected candidates were forever lost to higher education. Some of them were discouraged and disheartened and decided that such was their fate. Others who succeeded in removing the numerous obstacles once, had no strength nor possibility to renew the struggle. The first fight took their strength and energy, and they had not the same courage after the defeat at the door of the temple of learning. Most of them had to suffer the humiliation of reproaches and derision from their parents who felt victorious and urged the girls to stop making fools of themselves, to get married while there were bridegrooms, and to set their parents at rest in their old age.

Yet there is nothing more necessary and desirable than medical help administered by women. The peasants trust the medical ability of women much more than that of the men. The man-physician to them is first of all an official; the woman-physician, a kind lady with whom it is possible to have a frank, heart-to-heart talk. Any landlady or any woman inhabitant of a country-house, who gives medical advice to peasants and actually helps some of them, can easily take all the patients away from the physicians and the assistant surgeons of the "Zemstvo" stations. What is true of men applies in this case even more to the women-peasants who have recourse to the doctor only when their suffering becomes unbearable, and not until they have tried out every means known to the village conjurers, a procedure which only aggravates her condition. One can easily understand how necessary are midwives and nurses in the country where, as late as 1909, the conditions described below could be found in some remote villages. T. Ivanova, a peasant woman from Olonetz Province, published in the "Messenger of the Olonetz Provincial Zemstvo" the following letter of appeal:

"A pregnant woman attends to her household duties until the very child-birth. Usually during the delivery the lying-in

woman is hiding herself even from her family, due to the deeply enrooted belief that the labor is easier when nobody knows about it. In case of hard, slow labor the woman is helped in many ways: she is made to turn somersaults, is hung up; people try to frighten her; if this does not help the most 'radical' device is used, namely: the underwear of the woman's husband is washed, and she is made to drink that water.

"When the child is born, at its first bath, sulphur and ashes are added to the water to help it to grow strong; after the bath the infant is rubbed with the secundine to make its sleep better and more restful.

"The secundine is not buried in the ground for a whole week and is used, sometimes even rotten, for rubbing the baby's body. The very first day an effort is made to feed to the baby some chewed bread to make it 'grow stronger.'

"When the baby gets 'thrush,' its mouth is not wiped off. They say the baby's mouth is blooming. The thrush often turns into ulcers. Dirt causes lumps on the skin.

"In such cases the skin is first rubbed with chalk. If that does not help, dough is spread on a diaper and put around the baby's back. When the dough is dry, it is pulled off without being wet, often along with the skin. Ulcers are formed and begin to rot in the dirty surroundings. The baby usually dies.

"From the very first days the baby is fed raw milk through a sheep's horn which is never washed. Milk often curdles in the horn; worms are often found there in the summer.

"A plain peasant woman is appealing to all who hold the village dear to their heart and is imploring them to help.

"This help ought to, at least partially, disperse the darkness of ignorance without a glimmering light. For that, first of all, are needed the kind of people who are not to be found in the village."

Russian women have an excellent record not only as physicians, assistant-surgeons, midwives and nurses, but also as teachers and social workers. They taught the Russian masses to read and write; they made the most efficient purveyors of the furtive propaganda, and showed stronger character, firmer resolution, more dogged and dauntless persistence than men. Even now medicine and arts, including belles-lettres, constitute the most lucrative fields of activity for women.

The girl-students of the seventies were the most educated girls of the XIXc. They believed that the wide educational program drawn for them would actually open to them numerous fields of activity. The girls of the eighties lost their educational zest, since they were unable to apply their knowledge. They talked less about education as such, but appreciated more the practical value of a school diploma. In the nineties the girls began to lose their faith even in the diploma, seeing that many of the graduates with gold medals were out of work, while their friends who had not finished even the "Gymnasium" were earning money as clerks, copyists, etc. Yet the faith or rather superstition that some kind of a diploma was necessary still prevailed in spite of the fact that many girls left school as soon as they were old enough to become clerks, etc.

The end of the nineties, which was marked in Europe by the growth of the so-called feminist movement, did not find the same expression in Russia openly. But the cultural work of the preceding decades shows that there was a strong current of practical, instinctive feminism, which was working incessantly, sometimes perhaps even unconsciously, without defining itself in any special terms, but still giving the Russian woman a civic education and preparing her for political equality.

Philanthropy has been an outstanding characteristic of the

Russian woman from time immemorial. For the Moscow terem inhabitant it was the only field open to her for social work as well as for contact with the outside world. Even the *Domostroy* preached philanthropy, the giving of alms, food and shelter to all beggars, monks and people connected with the church, as a means of atoning for sins and having extra solicitors before God.

Feelings of compassion and philanthropy remained very strong among peasant women and women of the merchant class, but became considerably weakened among the higher classes after Peter's reforms gave the life of the woman of the world such varied, motley and frivolous interests that she had no time nor desire for bothering with beggars and cripples. Besides, the women receiving French education developed an aristocratic aversion to the rough, uncouth and slovenly peasantry. Only elderly ladies engaged in philanthropy to atone for their sins.

Convents in the old times of Russia, as also in other countries, were institutions that were not only religious but social, practically answering the peculiar conditions of society of that period. It was not only an involuntary abode of the "superfluous" women but also the voluntary place of refuge for women dissatisfied with the existing family organization.

Beginning with the XVIIIc. the position of the women in the family and in society became much more interesting, important and responsible. Entering the convent became a heroic action. Women tried to gain equal footing with men and were everywhere where men were fighting for liberty.

Count Palen, Alexander II's Minister of Jurisprudence, in his report to the Tsar in 1874, ascribed the chief success of the revolutionary propaganda to the presence among the revolutionists of a number of young women and girls who helped to cover the greater half of Russia with a net of revolutionary circles. Out of 23 centers of propaganda 6 were under the

leadership of women. There were 158 women and 620 men arrested as political offenders. This ratio of 1:4 is very characteristic. It is national. It was the same as in the popular revolts during the reign of Nicholas I.

It is remarkable that the percentage of women revolutionists who forsook the cause was negligible in spite of the fact that the woman was perfectly aware that she doomed herself to death by joining the ranks of revolutionists. She knew absolutely that it meant losing life in a very short time either through the punishment of the government or by suicide. Exile to Siberia was to a woman equal to death sentence within at most two to five years. Very few women were held back by this fact. Strong women appeared one after another while men got tired, changed their views, begged for pardon and expressed their desire to capitulate. When women of the old Russian revolution got tired or became doubtful of their strength to continue their activity or to bear the consequences, they considered the grave as the only way out and committed suicide. Russian women fought bravely for their freedom and education and though as yet they are behind their European sisters in higher education they have now many rights which the latter do not possess in equal degree, especially in the field of personal property and of civic rights.

III

THE PROVERBS¹

WHILE very few highly educated men and women permeated with the liberal and humanitarian ideas of the West, were sacrificing their social position, the comforts of life, and even life itself in their efforts to ameliorate general conditions in Russia, and while the rest of the higher and middle classes were, in spite of themselves, profiting by the cultural and educational reforms, also borrowed from the West, the peasants, who constitute 75 per cent of the Russian population, left to themselves, remained true to the old Russian mode of life and to the old ideas. The peasants kept on believing (some of them believe even today) that the earth is supported by three whales. When the whales shudder under the ground, they cause earthquakes. The heaven is God's throne, the earth His pedestal, the stars—little pieces into which God cuts up the old moon.

The Russians have a very rich folk-lore. It is the sum-total of the popular genius and wit and wisdom, the code of ethics and of laws for those who lodge their thoughts and the

¹ The significance of the proverbs has been so great that Russian scholars have been especially interested in collecting them and in classifying them. These proverbs differ in various parts of Russia but it has been our object to go through the chief collections and to select those which are most free from local peculiarities and are most widespread in the different sections of the country. There are variations between the Great Russians, the Little Russians or Ukrainians and the White Russians, but many features of the patriarchal existence, as shown by the proverbs, run through all classes of the Russian land and it is those aspects which we have tried to emphasize.

results of their observations in their memory rather than books, and who pass them on from generation to generation by word of mouth.

Of all the other forms of folklore, popular proverbs are especially rich in their inner content and are duly appreciated by all nations. The Eastern peoples call them the flower of the language, the unstrung pearls; the Greeks and the Romans—the dominating opinions; the Italians—the people's school; the Spaniards—the healing of the soul; the Germans—the wisdom of the street; the Russians—the outcry of the soul. Proverbs reveal very concisely but brilliantly and vividly the whole history of the people, their most intimate and sincere ideas of good and evil, their views on all social questions, on family life, marriage and divorce, on every phase of life and on every sphere of human interest. "One cannot live his life without proverbs," say the Russians.

The Russian peasant's scheme of life is quite simple: "God is the beginning and the end of everything." God is almighty but the devil is also very powerful, therefore: "Please God, but do not anger the devil." The devil is jolly and good-natured, very accommodating and helpful when treated properly, but wicked and vindictive when slighted or angered. To keep him in good humor "one must burn a candle for the devil also." "To live means to serve God." "God is in heaven, the Tsar on earth," i.e., the Tsar is God's anointed executing God's will, so by serving the Tsar one really serves God. During the period of serfdom the peasants said: "Our souls belong to God, our heads to the Tsar, our backs to the landlords." After their emancipation in 1861, which, as they cleverly summed up, left them with "Neither house nor home," the landlord's authority was unofficially but practically transferred to the Mir or the community. Left to their own resources to provide the necessities of life for themselves and their families, the peasants soon found out that: "God is high

and the Tsar is far" and self-help and self-reliance were necessary, and "God helps those who help themselves," so they invoked God's help in everything.

Even thieves prayed: "God, help me to get into somebody's bin, help me to grab the loot and to carry it out."

However, self-help is not sufficient to get along, mutual help is most essential: "Each for himself and for one another." That is possible only in the Mir. "A thread from each member of the Mir will make a shirt for the naked man." The Mir regulates every sphere of peasant life. Its sanction is necessary even for marriage and divorce, while under serfdom the peasants could not marry without the landlord's permission and had to accept his choice. The idea of an absolute necessity of the church sacrament of marriage was so foreign to the Russian masses, that many centuries had to pass before it finally permeated their consciousness, especially in Little Russia. Most likely the conclusion of a marriage contract completed the legal side of the marriage ceremony. According to Efimenko,² in some parts of White Russia, even today, in spite of the fact that the church ceremony is compulsory, the marriage contract gives the bridegroom and the bride the right to live as husband and wife. In Little Russia the church ceremony does not always coincide with the wedding feast, as is usually the case in Great Russia. Sometimes weeks and even months intervene between the two. The church ceremony ordinarily precedes, being the cheapest, but it does not give the marriage the social sanction without which the newlyweds cannot enter into marital relations. If one of them dies before the wedding feast, he or she is buried according to the ritual practiced in the burial of a boy or girl. This goes to prove that the social form of marriage is placed above the religious, that social sanction is considered as absolutely necessary, while

² *Izslidovania narodnoi zhizni.*

the sanction of the church is obtained principally because it is compulsory.

As popular sayings have it, "Each household has its own beliefs," and "So many towns—so many customs." Therefore a serious scientific formula for the whole mode of life and for its diverse phenomena varying with locality is impossible. However, broad generalizations, such as the proverbs are, may give a fairly correct picture of the reality.

It is safe to say that the Russian people, as a whole, have from time immemorial considered marriage as a purely social act, based entirely upon the free will and agreement or the contract of the parties entering into it. As a logical consequence, the dissolution of such a union was also thought of as depending solely upon the mutual agreement of the parties interested: "The wedding may take place only when the bridegroom and the bride really love each other," says an old Russian proverb. "Take even a little pig for all I care, my dear son; she'll be your wife and my daughter-in-law." "Whose business is it if the wife is not beautiful."

Russian law permits three marriages, the fourth marriage is rather an exception. "The first wife is given by God, the second by man, the third by the devil," say the people; so "Be satisfied with one legal wife."

The peasants take marriage very seriously, believing that it is made in heaven and heaven alone can separate husband and wife. "Whom God united no man can part." "God marries and God divorces." "Fate ties the hands so that they cannot be untied." "Married means tied forever." "The priest marries, but even the Tsar cannot separate." "Only death or the taking of orders (or veil) can save from a bad wife (or husband)." "Husband and wife are like flour and water; they can be mixed but never again separated." "A wife is not a dulcimer; you cannot hang her on the wall after having played for a while." "A wife is not a glove—she cannot be thrown

off the hand." "A husband is not a shoe—he cannot be thrown off the foot."

Legal divorce is extremely rare among all classes of society in Russia and practically unknown among the peasants, because it is accompanied by almost unsurmountable difficulties and prohibitive expense. Adultery is the only ground for divorce. The decree is granted only if there are eye witnesses to the act of adultery. The case has to pass through many departments. The legal proceedings usually last for several years and cost thousands of dollars.

Among the peasants, divorce, or rather separation, does not coincide with the canonic decrees, but it is accepted all the same by the local authorities. The peasants separate either according to mutual agreement, or on the initiative of one of the spouses. If the husband and wife separate voluntarily nobody interferes. The local peasant (*volost*) court feels free to give its sanction to an agreement in which husband and wife state definitely the conditions of their separation and pledge themselves not to interfere with each other's affairs. The initiative in separation is on one side, either when a husband wants to get rid of his wife, or when a wife wants to free herself from her husband. Either case is subject to the court decision. If the court does not find sufficient cause for separation, especially when a woman revolts against her husband's tyranny, the spouses are forced to continue to live together. If the court sees fit to separate the couple, it does it, in spite of the protestations of one side. The peasants, as a rule, do not know of the husband's legal right to force his wife to live with him. The village courts are also innocent of the fact that they are violating the law by sanctioning separations.

Marriage is an economic necessity for the peasant, who has to labor incessantly and very hard to eke out even a meager existence. "I do not eat the bread, the bread eats me." "The

flail in your hands, bread in your mouth; the flail out of your hands, bread out of your mouth." The harvest time is called in Russian "stradnaya pora" which literally means "the period of suffering." Naturally, the man cannot manage it alone, and an additional worker is more than welcome even in the patriarchal families.

The Russian peasants cannot separate themselves from the land: "We are God's, but the land is ours," say they.

Glieb Uspensky³ says: "Hardly any banker and capitalist studies as carefully all the possibilities to which his securities may be subject, as the peasant studies the smallest details of the natural phenomena which determine the success of his labor and his welfare. Not only is every day in the year, and almost every hour in the day noticed, explained and interpreted in accordance with the agricultural conditions of life; not only is there noticed and explained the appearance of each cloud, rain, snow, their qualities, form and even color (of the cloud); not only has every saint, miracle worker and apostle his name changed to suit the conditions of life of the agricultural people; but the Holy Scriptures themselves, if you listen to its village interpreters, seem to be written for the sole purpose of proving to the peasants that 'such and such a Tsar is coming and will give the land to the peasants.'"

On the one hand they live in perfect union with the mother-earth; on the other, they are in perfect subordination to it. According to Uspensky, the peasant is so enslaved to the land which he is cultivating, that he is not responsible even for his own actions. He is not guilty when he kills a horse thief because he cannot work on his land without a horse. It is not his fault if all his children die: he had no food for them because the earth did not bear crops. He beat his wife to death, but he is not to blame: she is a fool, a poor house-

³ *Sobr. Sotch.*, t. II, str. 116.

keeper; she hinders the work, and the earth—the real master—demands that work, and cannot wait.

Nature itself decides whether a peasant should marry, and when. "Now the rye crops promise to be good, so I may marry," says the boy. "If the crops are good and father makes a little money, I may marry," says the girl. "How can one get married when crops are poor?"

The late fall, when the crops are gathered and the food is secured, is considered the best time for contemplating marriage. "When the aspen gets red, children get mad," joke the White Russians. October the first is the feast of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin, the patroness of weddings. The peasant girls go to church on that day, burn candles before the ikon of the Holy Virgin and pray for a speedy marriage. "Holy Virgin," pray they, "cover my head." The peasant girls do not cover their heads, but the married peasant women wear either some sort of a cap or a kerchief. The headdress of the Russian women has the same meaning as the veil of the Orientals: it is the sign of a married woman. The omophorion of the Holy Virgin which resembles the wedding veil led the people to believe that she is the patroness of weddings. "Our Lady, Virgin Mary, give me a kind mother-in-law," implore the girls. They try to spend that day as pleasantly as possible, believing that: "If you have a happy day on the feast of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin, you are sure to find your destined." "The Intercession of the Holy Virgin comes, and the girls start lowing like cows," say the Little Russians.

The match-makers' busiest season is from the first of October until the twenty-sixth of October, which is the day of the Holy Martyr Dimitry. During this period the girls are particular in the choice of their husbands, but after that they lose hopes of getting married that year, believing that "If the Intercession of the Holy Virgin does not cover your head,

Christmas will not cover it either." "Girls are cunning until Dimitry, after Dimitry you can wipe the stove with them." October 28th, the day of St. Praskeva, is the girls' last hope: "Mother Praskeva, marry me off more quickly," pray they, and the men joke: "Make it this year, even though he has no teeth, and only one eye."

"To get married during the week before Shrovetide is to ally yourself to trouble." The month of May is very bad for marriage because at that time the peasants' food supply is almost exhausted. The one who marries in May shall suffer his whole life because it is difficult to find a good bride before the busiest season. "Who gets married in May, mishrives his whole life." "Good people do not get married in May." Summer time, especially before harvest, is also bad. "He got married when the people were cutting hay," say the people about an unhappy marriage. Before harvest time "A clever man takes a wife, a foolish girl gets married." February is considered to be the best month for honeymooning, because then the pregnancy will not interfere with the work in the fields during the harvest-time.

The Russians marry at a very early age, when they are yet under the full control of the parents. The legal age is eighteen for the boy and sixteen for the girl. Nominally the marriage cannot take place without the consent of the parties to it. "A forced marriage brings no happiness," but all the same the consent is very often forced upon the young people by their parents and relatives. Among the White Russians the mother's consent to the marriage of her daughter is considered more important than that of the father, and sometimes even of the daughter herself. In case of the son's marriage, the father's word carries more weight than that of the mother and the son.

The looking over of the bride, the making of the marriage contract and the wedding are the three usual steps in mar-

riage. The match-makers take part in all three steps. The match-makers are a whole institution in Russia. They are so important that the people say: "Choose not a bride but a match-maker." "A girl could not get engaged without a match-maker." "Just let your ears flap, the match-maker will do all the talking."

The old traditional commercial theory of marriage still prevails in the villages. The bride is still generally called the goods and the bridegroom—the merchant. In some places the match-makers, entering the house of the girl's parents, say: "We have heard that you have a nice cow." "Yes," agree the parents, "but she is not for sale." "We'll give you a very good price." "You could not buy her with all your money." "Let us bargain. What is your price," and so on, till they come to an agreement. The match-makers use all their eloquence in describing the good qualities of the bridegroom and the economic advantages of the proposed union, remembering the proverb: "If you don't cheat, you won't sell." They lie so much, that the people are sure: "Nobody can outlie a match-maker." "Shameless eyes, like those of a match-maker." "Only the match-maker swears for some one else's soul." "The match-maker takes others' sins on her soul." "Nobody can praise the other side like the match-maker." "A cunning match-maker is like a seven-headed snake." "Match-makers do not come with truth." "Match-making means boasting." "Match-making is murdering of the soul." "The match-maker gets the first glass of wine and the first stick." The place of professional match-makers is often taken by the bridegroom's parents or married relatives. Experience has taught that: "Single men are not sent as match-makers."

In former days, when the term "nyevyesta" for the bride actually meant "the unknown one," the looking over of the bride was quite an important function. The bridegroom's relatives or match-makers brought him into the girl's house to let

them see each other. Both, naturally, appeared in their best clothes, often using borrowed ones. Both, especially the girl, were scrutinized very carefully. The girl was spoken to in order to establish her mental ability. She had to walk to and fro; sometimes her face, hands and neck were felt to make sure that she was strong physically. When the young people know each other, often even too intimately, especially if they both are from the same village, the looking over really amounts to talking over, because the families on both sides know perfectly well everything about the other. If, however, the bride and the groom are from different villages, relatives or special emissaries are sent by the girl's family to verify the statements of the match-makers of the bridegroom about his financial status.

In the eyes of the people the marriage contract is the same as any other business contract, which can be made and broken at will, with the observance of the stipulations agreed upon at the time of its making. The marriage contract includes deposits, security, forfeit and references besides the final consent, the time set for the wedding, the division of wedding expenses, sometimes even the number of guests to be invited to the wedding. If the bride is a widow with children, definite stipulations are made about the bringing up and providing for those children. There is also a very detailed enumeration of the dowry, the presents on both sides and the paying a certain sum of money or giving certain things to the parents of the bride, where this custom is still in existence. It is rather rare nowadays, fortunately for the brides, because the bridegrooms' families, ill pleased with such large expenses, usually try to make the young bride make up for them by hard labor. Due to the prevailing illiteracy, most of the marriage contracts are oral, but made in the presence of witnesses. The courts accept them as legal documents. Instead of legal forms the peasants have symbolic actions differing according to

localities, but having full juridical force. The most popular form of closing the marriage contract is by two match-makers clasping hands and the third one, the witness, separating them. In some places the match-makers grasp each other by the right elbow. The Siberian Cossacks swallow a pinch of earth as an oath. In every case the symbolic action is followed by a prayer and then by a liberal drink.

The breaking of such a contract is considered a dishonest act deserving punishment both in heaven and on the earth.

To have your parents seal the bargain with a match-maker by drinking, means to be sold. "A pledged daughter is not your own any more." "Promised into marriage is as good as married." However, a refusal is possible: "A pledged daughter is not a married one." "We said but did not bind." "An engaged girl is not a wife; she may break the engagement." Only the wedding concludes the courtship: "There is no end without a ring and a wedding." "The wedding completes the affair."

The wedding is one of the three greatest events in life: "Thrice is man wonderful: at his birth, marriage and death."

The wedding is one of the greatest events in the life of the Russian people, because it introduces the man into a new circle of duties: those of the citizen and the head of the family. The marriage being a social act, concerns not only the two individuals who enter it, and their families, but also the whole community in which the bride and the bridegroom live. The community considers it its right and privilege to take part in the wedding feast. In case of the extreme poverty of the bridegroom and the bride the community bears part or even all of the expenses for the wedding feast, thus giving the marriage the necessary social sanction.

Marriage is always celebrated according to the numerous ancient rites and traditional ceremonies, the omission of which may, in the belief of the people, bring disastrous consequences.

Although in the cities, under the influence of culture and education, the wedding ritual is not observed very strictly, it is still considered indispensable in the more remote parts of the country, especially among the peasants.

The wedding feast is such an important occasion that everybody does his best to make it as elaborate as possible. The expenses before the conclusion of the marriage contract are usually paid by the bridegroom, and the wedding feast is provided by the bride's family. The Russian expression "to play the wedding" calls to mind the ancient games during which youths and maidens came together. Musicians and clowns are always engaged for weddings as the very act of marriage which is supposed to be based in its future on love and harmony, on family happiness, causes good humor and merriment. The church has made many efforts to uproot this direct trace of heathenism. Friends and foes, relatives and strangers, any passerby are entitled to participation in the feast, to a share in the food and drink, to dancing and singing and whatever other entertainments there may be. This curious custom has been transferred to America. The author who was invited to a Russian peasant's wedding in New York City, was surprised at the number of uninvited guests who made themselves quite at home in the banquet hall, ate, drank, danced, sang not only as if they were invited and welcome guests, but almost as if they were the only ones invited.

It was customary among the peasants and the townsmen for the bridegroom to send his bride a present just before the wedding. The present consisted of a head-dress, a pair of boots, a coffer with rings, powder, rouge, soap and mirror; there were also needles, thread, figs, raisins and a rod. It was supposed to signify that if the wife will be a good, diligent worker, she will be treated kindly and even spoiled, otherwise she will be flogged with rods. When it was time to go to church to be married, the father and the mother of the

bride took her by the hands and handed her over to the bridegroom. Then the father took a lash, and lashed his daughter saying: "Those lashes signify to you your father's authority, my daughter; from now on this authority goes into different hands. Your husband will teach you with this lash if you disobey him." With these words the bride's father gave the lash to the bridegroom, who said: "I do not think I'll need it, but I'll take it and keep it as a present." With these words the bridegroom puts the lash behind his belt. After the marriage ceremony the priest in his instructions to the newly-weds ordered the husband to whip his wife, as the head of the family ought to do.

The Russian marriage ceremony has preserved many old Greek and Roman rites, such as crowns, rings, the veil, the joining of hands, wedding presents, etc. The Russians, like the ancient Greeks, Romans and also the ancient Prussians, strew hops, grain and even money round the newly-weds. The meaning of this is clear—namely: that the young couple should live happily and have plenty of money and everything else.

The Russian round loaf of bread, as the symbol of a wedding, is also an imitation of the Roman wedding cake, made from flour, salt water and honey.

The bride's dancing with guests or giving them ransom is the substitute for the custom of "*Jus primae noctis*," according to which the bride belonged to the guests before she belonged to her husband.

The exchange of presents and the kind of presents, like apples, chickens, etc., are also remains of the past.

The taking off of the husband's boot is an old German custom. In Luther's time the young wife took off her husband's boot the first night and put it at the head of the bed, as a symbol of the husband's domination over the wife, of the man's authority over the woman. In Russia, in some places, after the marriage ceremony, the bride falls at the feet

of her husband, touching his boots with her forehead, and thus signifies her willingness to obey him; and the husband covers her with his lappet, as a sign of future protection. The wife takes off her husband's boot the first night. If she takes off the boot in which a coin is placed, she is to be happy for the rest of her life; if she gets hold of the boot without a coin, she is doomed to be subservient to her husband and to take off his boots every day of her married life. Then the husband lashes her with the lash given him by her father.

When the girl is taken to church for the marriage ceremony, she is instructed to be sure to step first on the rug, because she will be the "boss" if she does it.

The marriage rites vary greatly with the locality and present on the whole a complete ethnographic picture, throwing light on the symbols and allegories of the rituals which have long since lost their original meaning and continue their existence simply as customary and traditional. Here merge the old and the new, the religious and the popular, the sad and the gay.

The initiative of marriage always comes from the man. "The bride is not a horse; she cannot be led out on a platform." "When the girl is marriageable, suitors are always on hand." Match-making is an easy matter for the man. "A young man may look for a bride anywhere, but the girl cannot look for a bridegroom." "A young man can jump over nine fences; the girl cannot jump even over one." "For a man to propose marriage is just like borrowing a sledge; if he does not get it in one place, he'll get it in another." "Aim at a magpie, aim at a crow, some day you'll get a falcon." "A single man is like a hook; if he catches, he pulls; if he misses, he makes no inquiries." "Not every one gets married who proposes." "He proposed and hid himself." "Many are proposing, but only one marries."

While wooing and proposing as well as receiving attention

is not binding, the marriage is a life-long obligation which has to be entered into with great circumspection: "You get married once, but may suffer for the rest of your life." "Keep both your eyes open when you are getting married." "Girl, look for a husband for life, learn to know the man whom you are marrying." "The bride (the bridegroom) is like a horse: unknown goods." "Why hurry into marriage: if you marry well—you'll enjoy it long enough; if unhappily—you'll shed enough tears." "Marriage is not a race, you'll get there in good time." "To marry is to spoil another's life and to lose your own." Therefore, "Choose your bride yourself, not through Fedot and Foma." It is not good to be too particular: "To choose too long means never to marry."

After all, marriage is a question of luck: "To one a wife is a joy; to another—a misfortune." "One got married and saw light; another got married and lost his head." "Marriage is like drawing lots—who can tell what you may draw?" "Only the lucky find good wives and hidden treasures." "Try as he would, he still did not get a good wife."

Though: "Death and wife are destined by God," people ought to use their own judgment and common sense in choosing their partners for life. It is a difficult task to choose a suitable wife. There are so many things to be taken in consideration. First of all: "Judge the cow by her horns, and the girl by her family." "When you intend to marry look at the father and mother before seeing their child." "Do not buy a driver's horse, do not marry a widow's daughter: a driver's horse is overworked, a widow's daughter is spoiled." "The daughter is at home, but her character is known outside." "It is better the girl is not seen but known by everybody." "If bad rumors spread about a girl, nobody will marry her." "The saloon keeper loves the drunkard, but would not let his daughter marry one." "Choose a wife not

with your eyes, but with your ears." "The bridegroom is not looked at but heard about."

The place of residence is quite important. Girls are afraid to leave their villages: "Better a thief, but near home." "Better marry a whip, but in your own village." "Don't sigh heavily, you will not be given away far: it may be Foka, but it will be here." The boys prefer girls from other villages: "Do not buy a horse nor marry a daughter of your neighbor: both will run away." "Get a wife from afar, buy a cow near." "Even an owl, but from a different village." "The girl from near is a crow, one from afar is a she-hawk." "A girl is like a willow; she'll take a root wherever she is planted."

Intellect is a desirable quality in both husband and wife. It is really preferable to beauty, but too much of it is not good, especially in the wife. Education is rather a drawback because: "A literate wife will observe holidays," i.e., will not work. "A clever wife will not let you say a word." Yet: "It is better to drown yourself than to fall in love with an idiot." "A beautiful wife (or husband) is nice to look at; a clever one is easy to live with." "A handsome husband brings sin, a silly one ridicule." "Beauty is good only in lovers."

Physical strength is more important than intellect or beauty: "Let the wife be like a cow so long as she is strong." "Choose between a wife who will pull the wagon and one who will ornament your yard." "Don't praise the wife's body, praise her work." "O Father God! Give me a cap full of money and a plump wife, so that I have where to hit her if she does not work." The peasant needs a good worker. "Good are for the good ones, we want workers." "Not the dress but the housekeeping makes the girl beautiful." "You'll tire of beauty, but never of good food."

Good and congenial character is appreciated more than anything else, including money: "Let the husband be like

a bast-shoe so long as he is good." "Even gold brings on tears." "Do not look for beauty, look for kindness." "You are not going to live with riches but with the person." "Do not wish for a rich dowry, wish for a good loyal wife." "A rich dowry does not make a husband." (Of course: "The husband loves a rich wife and a generous mother-in-law," and: "To take a poor girl is not to be able to support her," so that on the one hand: "Let the wife be like a goat so long as she has horns of gold," or "Let her be a little pig if she has a chest of money." It is rare luck when: "A straw man takes a golden girl." But on the other hand: "One cannot live his whole life on his wife's riches." "The wife's riches stick in your throat," and: "A rich wife does not make her husband happy," because: "A rich wife is proud and often quarrels with her husband," besides: "If you take a rich wife, she will reproach you," and what is still worse: "A rich wife is the head of the family." "It is better not to take a rich wife than to let her boss over her husband." "A girl without a dowry is submissive," and: "A girl without a dowry is not a cheat: you take her for what she is," while: "The dowry in the hands of the father-in-law is not a dowry." "Brides are rich until their wedding." "The dowry, lawsuits and loans are not money but accounts." "Trust the dowry after the wedding." So that after all: "The dowry is not what the girl brings at the time of her marriage, but what she gets during her married life." Very poor brides and bridegrooms are made fun of: "Be satisfied if she has bones and flesh, make the dress yourself." "A fine comb and a broom and three kopecks." "A chest of underwear and a bride with a cataract." "A bride is not taken for Christ's sake." "He is a rich bridegroom: a cat and a hen are his cattle; a cross and buttons—his pewter." "What a bridegroom! No house nor estate, not even a log, no cow nor chicken, only a quarrelsome mother-in-law." However: "Poverty is not a vice," and

does not necessarily mean unhappiness. It often happens that: "Though there is nothing to eat life is jolly at least." "Do not take a dowry, take the girl you like." "Two beggars came together, but they are rich in love." Love goes with congeniality. "Similar customs—strong love."

It is a debatable question whether one ought to marry young. "Early marriage is an evident misfortune." "To marry at eighteen is to pay a heavy price," say some. But "The earlier the marriage, the more profit for the house." "If you rise early you will do more, if you marry young you will have help sooner," argue the others. All agree that: "A man who is not clever at twenty, not married at thirty and not rich at forty, is good for nothing." A very old man ought not to marry because: "An old man is not getting married for long." "To marry old is not for your own benefit."

The usual difference in the ages of husband and wife is from two to seven years: "To live with an old one is to spoil your life; to live with too young a one is to suffer; to live with your equal is to enjoy life." "The bee flies to a pretty flower, but even the devil would not look at an old woman." "To take an old one is to have trouble too often." "When a young man marries an old woman it is the same as when a young untamed horse is hitched to an old wagon: he will soon break the wagon." "To marry a young girl is to break company with bachelors." "An old husband is oppressive; a young one—intractable." "If the husband is old and the wife young—expect children; If the husband is young and the wife old—expect whip-lashes." "It is a lesson for you, grandma, don't marry your grandson." "An old husband and a young wife means discord." "It is pleasant to live with a young husband, but it is comfortable to live with an old one." "The wife loves an old husband when he is not jealous." "Better an old man than to remain an old maid." There is nothing worse than the position of an old maid in the peasant family,

and any girl over twenty is considered an old maid. "An old maid is the pest of the family." As such, she is the scapegoat of every member of the family and the target for derision. "An old maid and a torn sheepskin coat smell alike." "Instead of seven dogs keep one old maid: she will bark more furiously." "There is no one more furious than a priest's dog, a retired soldier and an old maid."

Widowers are undesirable bridegrooms: "A young man takes any girl he likes; the widower marries anyone that will have him." "Don't marry a widower: you'll become as gray as a sheep." Widows are also warned against in most cases, but still: "A widow has two sets of habits, but a widower has no end of them." Some think that: "If you marry a widow you'll sleep quieter." Others advise: "Do not start up with a young widow, better make inquiries from the people," because: "You do not know what trouble means unless you have courted a young widow." And the young men ponder: "What shall I do when I die? I shall have no wife in the next world." According to a popular belief, in the next world the widower-husbands join their first wives, and the widow-wives join their first husbands. That is why the young men prefer girls to widows, and the girls would have bachelors rather than widowers.

Marriage involves a great deal of bustling about, care, anxiety and responsibilities. "The one who is getting married cannot be lazy; he has to get up even against his wish." "It is not so terrible to get married, but it is awful to approach the priest on that subject." Marriage changes the man: "To marry is to change." "He did not know what trouble was, so he got married." "When one gets married he stretches like a bridge, after the marriage he sticks like a bone in the throat." "No wife—no care." "Father got me a wife and that was the end of my freedom." "To marry is to get tied to the house."

Marriage changes the girl also: "The girl is pretty until she marries." "They'll cover the head and lay on care." Girls enjoy much more freedom and have more leisure than married women. The "vetchernitzi" or "posidyelki," mentioned above,⁴ as well as games and choral dances take most of their time between Easter and the harvest time, also after the first of October until spring. During this time the girl is busy chiefly with getting her dowry ready. Every peasant girl has a big trunk which she gradually fills with her trousseau. When she spends evenings at home, she prepares feathers and makes pillows for herself. At parties, or "vetchernitzi" and "posidyelki," she spends part of the night embroidering and sewing things for her trousseau. All her earnings from private service, day labor, selling berries and mushrooms, etc., are her own and constitute part of her dowry. The girl's position is especially favorable when she becomes engaged: "Everybody likes an engaged girl." "An engaged girl has many suitors." "A girl's beauty is in the meadow (in the street), woman's beauty is on the stove in the corner," because the married woman has no time for choral dances. "A good marriage is like taking the veil," i.e., if the woman attends to her work properly she will hardly ever leave the house and yet will not get through with her work. "The woman would be better pleased with a little rest than with a new head dress." Not all the women work quite so diligently. It happens once in a while that: "Before the girl gets married she will give water even to the dog; after her marriage she does not want to wait even on herself." "The girl comes to love luxury when she gets married." "The wedding and the husband will make any girl beautiful." So that while: "The radish is bitter, yet people eat it; married life is hard, yet people marry." And while: "Women regret,

⁴ Cf. Page 10.

girls get ready for marriage." And not only are they willing to risk matrimony, but they want love. "One cannot be without sunlight; one cannot live without a sweetheart." "It is better to rot in the ground than to live with a loathsome husband." Peasant girls are just like the girls of any other classes and of any nationality: "The girl is like a shadow: if you are after her, she gets away from you; if you turn away from her, she follows you."

In Russia, as in any other country, the family organization is a true reflection of the state organization. The whole order of life, the interrelations of the government and the people, of the different classes of society and of the members of the community, are like a living example that, without words, stamps itself definitely upon the spiritual physiognomy of man. The Russian peasant's experience has been that: "One feels free only in his own home." "When the peasant is drunk, he feels equal to a nobleman; when he is sober he is afraid even of a pig." It must be a very unpleasant feeling, but unavoidable where fear of punishment in this or in the next world is the chief motive power for obedience and the strongest incentive to great actions. The peasant fears and obeys, and thoroughly learns the meaning of the proverb: "Each cricket ought to know its hearth." Accepting blind obedience as an inevitable evil, the peasant, according to the psychological law of compensation, decides that things are not so bad after all, because: "He who cannot obey, cannot command," and he can display his executive ability in his own household. "Among the people I do as I am ordered, at home—as I please." Thus he transfers the familiar organization of the outside world into his own family group. As God is the Head and the Ruler of the universe, and the Tsar of the whole of Russia, so the Russian man is the absolute head and the ruler of his family. "A man's house is his castle." "The master in the house is like the Khan in the Crimea." "The master

in the house is like Adam in paradise." "In my own house I arrange things to suit myself."

God Himself destined man to be the head of the family, by creating him in His own image, and the woman out of the man's rib. "Why did not God create Eve out of Adam's foot? In order that the woman should not run from saloon to saloon. Why not out of his hand? So that she should not pull her husband by the hair. Why not out of his head? That she should not be more clever than her husband. She was made out of his rib to take care of him and to serve him faithfully." Thus God created the woman not as the man's equal, but as an inferior, subservient being, as the man's servant and source of pleasure. Therefore: "The husband is the head—the wife, the pedestal." "The husband is the head—the wife, the soul." "Christ is the Head of the Church; the husband that of his wife." "The wife is like the chimney on the house; the husband like the dome on the church."

Due to her lowly origin and to the fact that she was the prime source of evil and of man's trouble in this world, the woman does not command much respect from men: "We cannot expect any good from our rib." "A chicken is not a bird; a woman is not a human being." "Girls are not human beings; goats are not cattle." "A woman was the cause of Adam's banishment from paradise." "Woman and devil have the same weight." "Woman and devil are near relatives." "Women are crafty." "Where the devil fails, he sends a woman." "Satan is an innocent babe in comparison with a wicked wife." Women are not to be trusted, because: "Who trusts the woman will not live three days." "A woman's heart is like rust on iron." "A woman's benignity is like a crocodile's tears." "Do not trust your horse, your dog and your wife." In spite of her cunning the woman is looked down upon as a fool, a weak creature, not possessing qualities necessary for the struggle for existence. "The woman's hair is long, but her

brain is short." "A dog is wiser than a woman: he does not bark at his master." The woman loses courage too easily, is helpless, impatient, always in a hurry, hare-brained and a babbler. "It is the woman's way to help trouble with tears." "A woman is like a bag: she carries whatever is put into her," i.e., she is a gossip. "It is better to start out on the sea in a rotten canoe than to trust your wife with a secret." Therefore: "The husband does not tell his wife all the truth, and when he tells he deceives her." Men do not appreciate the women's work: "All the woman does is eat and sleep." But the woman does not give up her rights very easily and keeps reminding the men of them: "He had three wives and suffered from all of them." "Why are you red? I want to marry. Why are you pale? I have married. Why are you happy? I am getting married. Why did you hang your head? I have married." The wife will accept suffering, but will not give in to her husband. "She is wearing out her third husband."

The woman loses her identity and name when she gets married. "Brought under a strange ceiling, given a new name." Taking a wife under his roof the man becomes her natural protector and supporter. "No matter where the old man gets it, he must have food for his old woman." "Sell your cross, but feed your wife." "Give her food and drink and send her to work." This last he certainly does. As her nourisher and protector the husband considers himself her highest authority. "The husband is the law unto his wife." "The husband is his wife's father; the wife is her husband's crown." "The wife is her husband's plaster, the husband is his wife's guardian." The woman lives "Between her father's fingers, but in her husband's hands." Girls say: "We may have fun whenever we wish; the young married women say: husbands do not allow it." "The wife is like a twig: twist her whichever way you want."

Considering himself immeasurably above his wife in every respect, the husband assumes the right and takes it as his privilege to "teach" her. Unfortunately, his methods of teaching are rather antiquated, and his school equipment is also old-fashioned, consisting of his fists, feet and a whip or a lash. Girls are comforted thus: "Don't cry when you are getting ready to be married, you'll do enough crying when your husband starts beating you." "Love your wife like your soul, shake her like a pear tree," is the motto of the Russian husband. "Not to beat a woman is not to get any good out of her." "Hit your wife harder, the soup will be tastier." "Beat the child from infancy, beat the wife from the beginning." "Beat your wife while she is young, and you shall have rest in your old days." "The one who does not beat his wife does not live in full domesticity." "Beat your wife oftener, it will be useful for the future."

Incomprehensible as it may seem, there are many women who not only think such treatment is normal, but feel very unhappy if they are not beaten, kicked or pulled by the hair. To them "It is woman's fate to be always beaten." So it is quite proper that "The girl is singing songs before her marriage and shedding tears after it." They agree with men that: "Not to beat the wife is not to be loved by her." The husband's beating not only does not hurt the wife, but is even good for her. "The blows of your beloved help to put on flesh." "Whoever loves brings suffering to the object of his love" and "I suffer from the one whom I love best."

The author heard a young peasant woman, a former servant, complain to the author's mother that she was very unhappy because she could not win her husband's love to the extent of getting a beating from him. "All he does," said that young woman, "is to kiss and caress me and tell me how much he loves me. He does not even let me do the hard work that other women do. Everybody makes fun of me and calls me

'lady.' I don't know what to do to get him at least to pull my hair. When I reproach him, he just laughs and kisses me again, and says that his hand is too heavy for me, so he is not going to beat me as long as he lives, no matter what anybody says about it." When the author expressed her sincerest surprise at the woman's complaints, the woman said: "You cannot understand it, miss. It is different among the people of your class, but no peasant treats his wife like a lady if he really loves her."

It seems to be a sad state of affairs when the women take such an attitude. However, "The devil is not as terrible as he is painted," and the Russian husband is not as bad as he depicted himself in these proverbs. He has many reasons for not treating his wife too harshly. One of them is his realization that: "Love cannot be forced," that "Fear may be inspired, but love cannot be coerced." Besides, not all wives are willing to tolerate the "teaching." Some of them prove to their husbands that they are as good teachers themselves. That gave rise to the proverb: "In former years husbands used to beat their wives; now the wives thrash their husbands." The women had to take the law into their own hands because they could get no justice in the courts. They act according to the proverb: "It is simpler to take the law into your own hands."

The Russian law considers the husband and wife as an indissoluble unit, therefore their mutual and personal interests cannot be opposed. On the basis of this, the Russian criminal code makes no provisions for cases of accusations of husband or wife in personal offenses or injuries. Physical violence is subject to prosecution only when it becomes very acute. Offensive verbal or physical behavior of one toward the other is not considered an act forbidden by law, and gives the injured party no right to seek defense either in the criminal or in the civil courts, such claims not being compatible with

the entity of marital relations. It is interesting that although "cursing does not hang or stick on one's collar" beating is considered less shameful than the use of vile language. "The basis for such a view is found in religion," says Zherebtzov, the author of the *"Russian Civilization Composed by Zherebtzov."*⁵ "Religious people cannot conceive as shameful corporal punishment to which the Saviour of the human race Himself was subjected. They believe that the verbal insult strikes the immortal part of the man, while beating affects only the more lowly parts of the human being."

"When the wife beats her husband it's for his own good." "The wife does not punish her husband, but makes him obey her," say the women, but men do not agree with them and protest vigorously: "The wife may scold her husband but must not beat him." "The magpie will have to turn white, before the wife should beat her husband." "The hen will never crow like a rooster; the woman will never be lord over the man."

The husband must never forget his position and dignity. To yield to his wife means to dishonor himself in the eyes of his friends: "Woe unto him who does not preserve order in his house." "Sad is the house in which the cow instructs the bull." "To give in to fools of women is to make chickens laugh." "Where the wife's will rules the house, sad is the fate of the husband, it is better for him to strangle himself." "Woe unto the house in which the wife rules." The woman must not be allowed to have her own way because: "If the husband lets the woman have her own way, no good will come out of that." "To give freedom to the wife means to become a slave yourself." "God is free and so is the woman if she takes her liberty." "The wife who got away from under her husband's control is worse than Satan." "Where the wife is the boss, the husband spends his time in other people's

⁵ Dobrolyubov, v. 2, p. 257.

houses." "To be lenient with your wife is to have to look for her in other people's houses." "To love your wife is to be strict with her." Though "strictness," meaning beating, is a very common thing, people are more or less ashamed of it. The husband is advised: "Do not teach your wife in the presence of your children, nor the children in the presence of other people." "Drink beer but do not spill it; love your wife but do not beat her." The wife is told: "Cry, young wife, but do not tell anybody about your troubles." "You must obey the one you love."

Love and harmony are the ideal of family happiness. When people congratulate the newly married pair they say: "God grant you love and harmony." Interference of strangers is not desirable even in quarrels, because: "No one but God can judge between a husband and a wife." "Husband and wife are one Satan." "Husband and wife are like a snake and an adder." "The husband is like the wife." "The devil must have worn out more than one pair of iron shoes before he brought them together." "Even a thread cannot be pulled between husband and wife." "When lovers quarrel they are just amusing themselves." "Husband and wife quarrel but sleep under one overcoat." "Where there is love there are quarrels." "They feel crowded when together, and lonesome when separated." It is usually said about the quarrels: "Water got mixed with sand," i.e., the sand will soon settle on the bottom, and the water will be clear again. Friendly relations are the basis of ideal family life: "Where there is love and friendship there is no room for sorrow." "No treasure is needed where there is harmony between husband and wife." "Husband and wife are one soul." "Where there is love there is God." "A man has three friends: his father, his mother and his true wife." But: "The wife is dearer than the mother and nearer than the father." Therefore: "Respect your father and mother, but respect your wife five times as much." "Be

kind to your wife, take good care of your daughter, and there will be no quarrels." "My wife is half of the village to me." "To be ashamed of your wife is never to have children." "It is bad when the wife does not allow," i.e., there is a discord in the family which interrupts the normal course of life and activity.

"The wife is her husband's friend, not servant." "God help the bachelor; the wife will help the married man." It is interesting that the husband and wife call each other "the family" or "the little family." There was an old Russian verb of the same root, which meant "to come together," so that originally the term "family" was not an abstract conception of a group of people, but a concrete notion of one of the persons present. In its meaning it corresponded to the word comrade or partner. Family is a kind of partnership, and supposedly the best kind. At least the people say: "There is no better partnership than that of a husband and wife."

The woman is an extremely important economic factor in the peasant household. The welfare of the family depends as much upon her as upon her husband. "Husband and wife have one stomach." While their interests are common, the spheres of their activity are different. The husband is the social representative of the whole family. "The wife takes her color from her husband; her honesty is like his." "The wife's place is where the dough is kneaded." "The woman's road is from the stove to the threshold." "Let the woman into paradise; she'll take her cow along." "Father talks about war, mother about expenditures." "The husband is the builder of the house and the protector from need," but: "The wife keeps the house together." "Men marry for soup, women marry for meat," i.e., it is the man's place to procure and the woman's to prepare food. "The husband threshes wheat, the wife bakes bread." "The yard is crying for a master, the house for a mistress." "The man and the dog should be

always in the yard, the woman and the cat in the house." "The master of the house should smell of wind, the mistress of the house of smoke."

The woman practically plays the predominant role in the household: "The wife holds the house by three corners, the husband by one." "If the man begins to play the fool, half of the house will burn; if the woman, the whole house will burn." "Though the woman works like a slave, she is the lady at the table." "Girls fill the street; women fill the oven." "A good housekeeper's home is like a brimming cup." "A good housekeeper will save the house, a poor housekeeper will ruin it." "If there is a housekeeper, there is no fear of the beggar's bag."

The peasants fully appreciate the fact that: "If the wife does not save, the husband never will," and that: "The man will never carry in as much with a bag as the woman with a pot." "Life is good when the husband brings half a rouble and the wife makes linen for the same household." Since the wife shares her husband's work, she ought to know his plans and ought to be consulted: "I'll think it over with my pillow and talk it over with my wife." "A happy marriage teaches, an unhappy marriage drives out of the house." "With a good wife grief is only half grief, and joy is double." "A good wife and fat soup—what else can a man wish for?" "A good wife." "Better a drunkard than a wilful wife." "A bad wife spoils even a good husband." "With a good husband even a little pig is a lady." "With a good husband any woman is a wife; with a bad husband even the priest's daughter is a slave."

It takes time to find out good and bad qualities of husband and wife, so: "Do not boast of your marriage after three days, but after three years." "Do not praise your wife after seven days, but after seven years." "The husband loves a healthy wife, and the brother a rich sister." "The husband

does not love a sickly wife." "One does not need a cow if he has a strong wife." "The husband does not like a talkative wife." "Better a drunkard than a wilful wife." "A bad wife will disgust her husband; a good one will attract many strangers." The wife is dear on two occasions: When she is brought into the house and when she is carried out of the house." "Water, fire and a bad wife are the three evils."

To the woman a husband is a protector, first and foremost: "Parents take care of their daughter until her marriage; a husband till the end of her days." "A married woman has a defender." "One is living not with her parents, but with her husband." "When I hide myself behind my husband's back I am not afraid even of death." "Behind my husband's head it is like being behind a mountain: with him as my shelter, I am not afraid of anyone." "A husband may be like a crow, but he is protection for his wife all the same." "Take care of your husband lengthwise and crosswise, but do not cross the threshold without him." "Without a husband is the same as without a head; without a wife the same as without brain." "God will spare the husband, and will not take him away when he is needed." "It is bad with a husband, twice as bad without him."

There is no greater calamity than the death of either husband or wife: "To lose a spouse is to have a lot of suffering." "God save from fire and widowhood (or the state of a widower)." "It is better to have seven fires than to remain a widow (a widower) once."

Sad is the condition of a widower: (He whose wife did not die, does not know what grief means.) "It is not the child that cries, nor the beggar that laments; it is the widower who cries and laments." "It is bad with a wife but worse without one." "A husband without a wife is like a goose without water." "A widower is not a father to his children, he is an orphan himself." Of course: "God wouldn't wrong you:

He'll take away a woman and give a girl." "Don't cry for your wife, you'll have another one," but as was said before, it is not so easy for a widower to get a wife, especially a good one.

The position of a widow is still worse: "Without a husband a woman is always an orphan." "A wife without her husband—what can be worse?" "A bad husband dies, and a good wife becomes a beggar," and that in spite of the popular belief that: "Behind the widow is God with a bag." "God takes care of the widow, but the people don't care for her." "Woe unto him who wrongs a widow," is an old saying. "Throw at least a piece of wood into the widow's yard," say the kind people. But it is not always safe to help the widow because: "Even if you throw but a piece of wood into the widow's yard, people will add to it all kinds of nonsense." So it comes that: "It is misery with a husband, but still worse without him," and "A widow with a child must needs howl like a wolf."

Casting aspersions upon those who trespass against morality is found strangely side by side with the existing comparative freedom of sexual relations and the popular sayings: "Don't knock on anybody's gate with a whip if you don't want anybody to knock on yours with a big cudgel." "Don't sweep your neighbor's house; see that your own is clean," and: "Whose business is it that the godmother was sitting with the godfather?" Chastity is demanded from women, not from men, perhaps chiefly because: "The husband's sin remains outside, the wife's sin is brought home." "To a good wife, staying at home is not a torture; she suffers only when parted from her husband." "It's better to get drowned than to marry a dissolute woman." To a woman: "To fall in love with another woman's husband is to ruin your own life."

Illicit relations are looked down upon and condemned. The people who live together out of wedlock are said to be

married: "Without a priest, without a cross, around a fir-tree." "Married around a fir-tree to the accompaniment of the devil's songs. Illegitimate children are called 'Self sown children.'" "To Bogdanushka every man is the father." Bogdan was the name given to the illegitimate children who were brought up in the foundling asylums. "Nikita is the product of bundling."

The Russian peasants seldom adopt children claiming that: "If you did not give birth to him, he is not your son; if you did not buy him, he is not your serf." "You cannot make your own child out of someone else's little devil." The result is that: "The hare, the sparrow and the adopted child fare worse than anybody else in the world."

Orphans fare a little better. "God is the orphan's guardian." "The one who feeds an orphan knows God." Orphans are pitied: "While she was growing she did not see the spring; when she grew up, she did not see the summer; the fall came and did not warm the orphan's heart." "An orphan is scolded, beaten and not allowed to cry." "Everybody knows when an orphan gets a dinner, but nobody knows when an orphan is crying." At the same time there is a peculiarly hostile attitude toward orphans: "Help an orphan, and he will put your eyes out." "Feed a snake and he'll wind around your neck." "An orphan has two mouths: he eats with one and tells lies with the other."

Their own children are God's gift: "God gave, God took." "Children are God's blessing." "He who has children is not forgotten by God." "God gave children; God will provide for the children." To the peasants, children are an asset as well as a liability, especially if the children are born lucky. And "Lucky are the children who will bring joy to their father and mother." "A lucky daughter resembles her father, a lucky son—his mother." Of course, heredity plays a very important role: "One cannot expect a good generation from

a bad seed." "Your father brought you into the world looking at himself." "No wonder: her mother was like that." "An apple does not roll far away from the apple tree." "The twig is like the tree." If the children are not a great success, the peasants say: "There's a skeleton in every family." "The ikon and the spade are made from the same tree." "Different children are born from the same father and mother." "The father cannot give brains to his silly son." "Children who work are bread for father." "No treasure is needed when the children are good." "If the son is not as clever as the father, it is a pity, if the son is more clever than the father, it is a joy; if one brother is brighter than another, there is envy."

Children are welcome though they mean a good deal of care and anxiety: "Children are a joy, children are also a sorrow." "He who has children has troubles." "He who does not give birth to children does not grieve." "Children are like flowers: they need care." "It is lonesome without children; it is troublesome with children." "Little children—little sorrows; big children—big sorrows." "Little children don't let you sleep, big children don't let you breathe." "If other people's children are naughty, we laugh; if ours—we grieve." Children mean great expense: "It is one of the two: either have children or save money." "God grant that the one who has children has enough food for them." "The trouble is not when all children get under one overcoat, the trouble is when each child needs an overcoat." "If the father has three sons, his whole back will be blue; if the mother has three daughters, she'll have to go without a chemise."

The children mean not only an economic but a great moral responsibility: "The father is not the one who brings the child into this world, but he is the one who feeds it and teaches it, and makes something good out of it." "If you knew how to bring a child into the world, know how to teach it." "Even a little pig walks bravely behind her father and mother and acts

arrogantly." "Good children are a crown to their father and mother; bad children are their peril." And to make the children good, both father and mother must take care of them and teach them. "Mother gives birth and mother brings up; father teaches." Though there is an old saying: "Consider your father as God, and your mother as your equal," the mother's influence is really the strongest: "What the mother puts into the child's head the father will never knock out." "As God is to people, so is a father to his children," but: "Without a father the child is half orphan, without a mother the child is a complete orphan." "Mother's beating does not hurt." "Mother raises her hand high, but does not strike hard." "The father's curse dries one up; the mother's curse destroys." "Your father's and your mother's prayers can raise you even from the bottom of the sea; their curse drowns you in a puddle."

The Russian Epic gives many examples of children's obedience to the will of their parents and of respect for the parental, especially the maternal blessing. "Fear your father and respect your mother." The mother is often the guardian. For example, Prince Dimitry Donskoy said in his will: "And you, my children, live in harmony and obey your mother in everything. If one of my sons dies, my princess will divide his estate among the rest of my sons. Every one should be satisfied with what she gives him, and should not oppose her will. And if any of my sons will be disobedient to his mother he will not have my blessing." The agreement of the Grand Duke Vasily Dimitryevich with his brothers begins as follows: "According to the word and blessing of our mother Avdotya." Vasily Dimitryevich orders his son to hold his mother "in respect as God had commanded"; in another paragraph of his will he bids his son respect his mother as much as his father. Peter the Great is a good example of the struggle between his own will and desire and his filial duty toward his mother.

Anxious as he was to set out for sea, he did not venture out until he succeeded in obtaining his mother's blessing.⁶

Father and mother are their children's best friends: "There is no friend like your own father (mother)." "The wife is for advice, the mother-in-law for welcome, but there is no one dearer than your own mother." Father and mother must teach, but not spoil the children. "Unfortunate are the children who are not chastised by their parents." "Who spoils the children, cries himself." "Friendly scolding is no offense; it will save from shame in the future." Care is necessary: "Who has a nurse has his child safe." The peasant mother is very busy: "The child does not cry, the mother does not hear." "A good nurse makes the child brighter." But: "It is bad for the children when they have too many nurses." "Where there are seven nurses the child is without an eye." "Where there are nurses, there are many holed in the cemetery" (high mortality). "Toys do not spoil the child, the servants do."

The training of children must be started from infancy: "He who is not cared for properly in the crib, will be miserable all his life." "Bend the tree while it is young, teach the child while it is obedient." The views on methods of teaching are different. Some say: "Teach the dog with a stick, and the child with love." "With spirit of kindness, not with a heavy cudgel." "Punish the children with shame, not with strictness and the whip." Others, the great majority believe that the proper way is to: "Love your child with your heart, but crush him with your hands," because: "If father does not beat his young son, the son beats his old father." "While the child is growing people say: Don't hurt yourself!—When the child has grown—Child, don't hurt me!" "When the children grow up they will scare their father." "A bad son is the

⁶ Solovyev, *History of Russia*, Ch. XIV.

father's sin." "An unpunished son is a dishonor for his father." Therefore: "Punish your children while they are young, and they will comfort you in your old age." "Parents' beatings make the children healthy." "If God gives you sons, don't be lazy, teach them and beat them." "A whack on the back is instruction for the son." "Flog the child while he can be put across the bench; when he stretches himself along it, you'll get it from him." "The young people must be held on the bridle." "Where is fear, there is piety." "Where is no fear there is no modesty." Sense must be beaten into the young head. "The father's orders are not onerous for an obedient son." "If he did not obey his father, he will obey the whip."

Parental authority ceases when the children begin to attend school. Then it is said: "Do not mind the parents, mind the teachers." But sometimes it is quite difficult to open a school in a village. The author knows the following curious instance: An inspector of schools was very anxious to open a school in a village. The peasants did not want it, saying that they had enough taxes to pay as it was, that they were too poor, had no building, could not pay the teacher, etc. The inspector urged them to shut the saloon and to turn the building into a schoolhouse, and volunteered to equip the school and provide a teacher. He used all his eloquence, pointing out all material advantages and spiritual joys given by education. The peasants were quite convinced by his arguments and charmed by his democratic manners, but would not give him a definite answer, because: "The one who acts hastily makes the people laugh." In Russia it is considered necessary to: "Measure seven times before you cut once." The inspector was asked to come again for their final decision. The inspector came, but was told that they were still considering the matter, but since: "God loves the Trinity," he would have to come for the third time before they finally made up their mind.

Each trip took three days of riding on horses, as there was no railroad. It was a very tiresome trip. But being as stubborn as the peasants and also being sure of his success, the inspector made the third visit, as requested. Great was his surprise and disappointment when, on his third visit, the peasants turned a cold shoulder on him. They did not welcome him as before, each peasant tried to avoid him, and when addressed, would scratch the back of his neck (the sign of embarrassment) and direct him to some one else for information. Finally one man told him to ask the women. The eternal: "*Cherchez la femme!*" The inspector found the right woman, a bitter opposer of the school and she told him that their parents and grandparents had no schools, and they should not have any because it was God's will that they should not. God came to her in the night and asked her to follow Him. He took her all over His domain first, then through the angels' abode. Everything there was so resplendent that she became dazzled and could not distinguish any faces. "Open your eyes, Akulina," said God, "and look around. You'll see some familiar faces here." And, sure enough, Akulina recognized Ivan and Peter, Andrew and Michael, and every other man who was opposed to the opening of a school. "Remember those faces," said God, "and follow me further." They began to descend. It was getting hot and smoky. Wild shrieks were heard. Akulina was blinded again. "Keep your eyes open, Akulina," commanded God again. "Look around. You'll find some familiar faces here also." And, to her horror and joy, she saw every man who was in favor of the school being burned by the devils. "Remember those faces also," said God. "And now I'll let you go back to the earth, to your village. Tell the people what you saw. I am giving them a fair warning." Akulina told her story to the villagers, and there was no school opened in that village for the next fifteen years. Of course this is an exception. Illiterate as the peasants are, they highly

appreciate the value of education: "The world lives by God's will; the people live by learning." "Education is light; ignorance—darkness." "Education is an ornament in good luck, and refuge in misfortune." "Illiterates are not appointed as priests; ignoramuses do not rule over clever people." "One must be a soldier before becoming a general; one must be a sailor before becoming an admiral." "A profession is not carried on the shoulders but makes life easier." "Education is better than riches." However, "Education is not beer; it cannot be poured into one's mouth," and: "A school without punishments is like a mill without water," because "There is no learning without suffering." But this is right because: "Two unflogged ones are offered for one who was flogged, but they are not accepted." When the children grow up, they naturally become independent: "The son is mine, but he has his own mind." "What do I want a father for when I am a clever fellow myself," say the young men annoyed by parental control.

All children are equally dear to their parents: "Your own child is dear to you even if it is a hunchback." "No matter which finger is bitten, it hurts." "All children are equal: Boys and girls." Yet: "The boy is the father's comfort; the girl, the mother's joy." Boys are preferable on the whole because: "A boy is born to help, a girl to amuse." "The son looks into the house, the daughter—out of the house." "Feed your son for the time being, when the time comes your son will feed you." "With a son one may save; with a daughter the last savings will be spent." "Put a daughter into the crib and a dowry for her into the chest." "Bringing up a daughter is like pouring water into a broken barrel." "A daughter is no gain for her parents." "Comb her hair until she is seven, watch her after she is seven, and then pay somebody to take her out of your house." "A son will feed you, if not with bread, with slaps in the face; the daughter will carry out the last piece

of bread." "A married daughter is a piece cut off." "A cut off piece will not stick to the bread." "To marry off a son is to praise God; to marry off a daughter is to cry bitterly." "Marry off a son whenever you wish; marry off a daughter whenever you can." "Give your daughter away when someone is willing to take her." However, the younger daughter cannot be married before the older: "You cannot thresh every other bundle."

All the members of a family are supposed to compose one unit. They ought not have any personal desires or demands, but to obey the general will. All must work for one household: "Fight but do not part." "Silly is the bird that does not like its nest." The family is likened to a workman's association, the "Artel," and: "An artel is strong because of its chief." The father is the chief of the family. "There is no chief higher than the master of the house." His position is based on the fact that everything is acquired chiefly by his labor and economy. "Die, but do not leave your father's land," demands the father, and he is usually obeyed. "He who respects his parents never perishes." "He who respects his father is preparing for himself a place in paradise." "Respect your father and God, and everything will be open to you." "God does not lead into trouble the one who respects his father." The son acquires equal rights with his father only in cases of extreme necessity as, for instance: "On the battlefield father and son are comrades."

Good relations among the members of the family are almost invariably broken when there are children from different fathers or mothers: "Life might have been harmonious if not for different children." "It's better to work for strangers than to try to please a step-mother." "The step-mother gives her step-son a free choice: go either naked or without a shirt." "Looks out of a corner of an eye, just like a step-mother." "Sad is the life of a step-son, nor is the life of a step-mother

sweet." "The mother strokes you with the grain, the step-mother, against." "Life is sometimes good, sometimes bad; sometimes like a mother, sometimes like a step-mother." "The winter sun is like a step-mother; it is bright but not warm." "Abundance is mother: misery—step-mother." "Your fatherland is your mother, a strange country is a step-mother." Even when "The step-mother is good, yet she is not like a real mother."

The children are taught: "Do not forsake your father and mother in their old age, and God will not forsake you." "Take good care of your father and mother, you will not find other parents." "You can buy everything except father and mother." The children are credited with saying: "When I have a father, I feel like killing him; when I have none, I feel like buying one." But it is a sin to ill-treat the parents. There is even a belief that a man who raises his hand against his parents shall forever live in misery. "The hands which beat father or mother shall never be able to earn anything." The children know it is their duty to take care of their aged parents, but this is easier said than done. In the first place: "When the earth takes the parents the children get their freedom." Then again the children are not usually very anxious to help their parents. "To pay old debts and to feed old parents are the hardest things in the world." "One father will feed nine children sooner than nine children will feed one father." "The mother tears the bodice of her dress hiding things for her children; the children tear their clothes hiding things from their mother." When the father is cared for by the son, it is said: "Let the father plow the fields; the horses know him; and I'll go to the saloon; people are waiting for me." The parents do not like to depend upon their children's maintenance: "God, take away my life rather than let me be under my son's care."

Yet no matter how harsh a treatment the old father may

expect from his son, he is at least sure of having a roof over his head. The real misfortune is to depend upon the son-in-law. Just as the father marries off a son to have a life-long worker, so does he take into his house a son-in-law "to have somebody to feed you till death and to close your eyes." Since the man plays a much more important role in the peasant family than a woman, the position of a son-in-law is much more enviable than that of a daughter-in-law. The son-in-law sometimes gets the best even of his father-in-law: "Take in a son-in-law and get out yourself." "The father gave a rouble to have a son-in-law brought in, he'd give a rouble and a half to have him taken out." "When you are quarreling with your son, get on the oven, when you are quarreling with your son-in-law, hold on to the door knob." "When your son chases you out of the house, get on the stove; when your son-in-law begins to grumble, get hold of the door." "When you are fighting with your son, get the pie (the son wouldn't take it away); when you have a fight with your son-in-law, run out of the yard." "God deliver me from eating a son-in-law's bread."

The relations between the in-laws are far from happy. Usually neither father- nor mother in law consider the son-in-law as a son: "You cannot make bacon out of dog-meat, you cannot make a child out of a son in-law." "The son-in-law may become dear for the sake of the daughter, the son may grow disgusting through the daughter-in-law." "The father-in-law likes respect, the son-in-law likes to take, the mother-in-law likes to give, and the brother in-law screws up his eyes—he does not feel like giving." "There is no enemy like a son-in-law." "He would not be a son in law if he did not have the reputation of a dog." "One cannot save enough for sons-in-law." "Our sons-in-law have many schemes." "Nobody is surprised if the son in-law is quarreling with his mother-in-law." "If you want to have quarrels in the house, take in a son-in-law." "The son-in-law is most welcome as a

guest to his mother-in-law; but he becomes the worst robber when he is taken into the house." If the father- and mother-in-law are trying to please the son-in-law, "It is not for the sake of the dog of a son-in-law, but for the daughter's sake."

The sons-in-law do not waste much love on their wives' parents either: "The mother-in-law is a wicked satan." "When the mother-in-law comes into the house, everything is turned topsy-turvy." "Visited the mother-in-law, but was glad to run away." "Don't spare the property of the mother-in-law, dig to the bottom in the butter dish." "If there is a father-in-law, let him be, but still a dog is better than a father-in-law."

"Even a father-in-law does not like a poor son-in-law," and the son-in-law has plenty of reasons for saying: "Fear a rich father-in-law as you would a horned devil." "The son-in-law has a big place in the corner, where the pokers are." "The coat of the son-in-law is always under the bench." When the people see a dog without a tail, they say: "He must have lost his tail because he lived in the house of his father-in-law."

In spite of the fact that: "The daughter-in-law will patch your shirt, and the son-in-law will pull off your trousers," the position of the daughter-in-law is very disagreeable, especially in the patriarchal family. In the normal family the wife is subordinated only to her husband, and even that not always. If she has a stronger character or is more clever, she is not only her husband's equal but sometimes his superior. In the patriarchal family, unless she is the wife of the eldest son, neither brains nor strength of character, in fact, nothing can save her from subordination and oppression. Her significance as wife is secondary. Her husband is not the head of the family, present or future, therefore she must adjust her relations not to him alone, but first of all to her father- and mother-in-law, then also to her brothers- and sisters-in-law. When a young man brings his bride into his parents' house he says: "Here is a life-long housekeeper for you, father; here

is a life-long washerwoman for you, mother, and a young wife for me."

Sakharov,⁷ a virtuous daughter-in-law is "Submissive to her father-in-law, obedient to her mother-in-law, attentive to her brothers-in-law, obliging to her sisters-in-law, loving toward her husband." Thus her first duty becomes the last.

On the day following the marriage the mother-in-law lashes the young bride gently to establish her authority, and says: "This is that you fear your father-in-law; this is that you fear your mother-in-law; this is that you fear your husband." The young bride flatters her thus: "My father-in-law is my protector, my mother-in-law is my defender." But she knows only too well that: "The father-in-law is not the father." "The father-in-law is to be feared; the mother-in-law will put your eyes out." "The father-in-law is fussy and fond of dealing out blows; the mother-in-law is forever scolding; the brother-in-law is a banterer; the sister-in-law is a trouble-maker; the husband is jealous." "When I lived in my father's house I had a load of hair; in the house of my mother-in-law the flies ate even my forelock." "This is as pleasing as the fist of your mother-in-law." "The mother-in-law remembers her own youth and does not trust the daughter-in-law." "The daughter-in-law is first and foremost a worker you don't have to pay." "It does not matter if the daughter-in-law is a fool so long as she gets up early and starts the fire." "The father-in-law when he scolds his daughter gives a lesson to his daughter-in-law." "The cat is beaten, the daughter-in-law slandered." "Everybody sleeps, but the daughter-in-law is ordered to thresh." "A wicked mother-in-law has eyes in the front and in the back of her head." The daughter-in-law is treated disdainfully and unjustly: "Our daughter-in-law eats up everything, she devours even the honey." "Whose fault is it? The daughter-

⁷ *Skazania Russkago Naroda* (I; 3, 113).

in-law's. Where is she? She is not home—that's her coat hanging on the nail." "Who brought in the water? The daughter-in-law. Who cooked the dinner? The daughter-in-law. Who did the work on the landlord's estate? The daughter-in-law. And who is beaten? The daughter-in-law. And why is she beaten? Because she is a daughter-in-law."

But that is not the worst. The chief reason for the customary crying and lamenting of the bride before the marriage ceremony was not so much the enmity of her future relatives, as the *jus primae noctis* and the right of the father-in-law to force his daughter-in-law to have sexual relations with him at any time, especially during the absence of her husband.⁸ That evil was so widespread when the term of compulsory military service was very long, that it gave rise to a proverb: "No one should be advised to marry and then enter the military service."

At present this custom is very rare in Little Russia and is gradually being eradicated in Great Russia by the sons. The peasants usually sleep all in one room, on the floor. If a son discovers his father next to his wife in the night, he rebukes the old man. The latter gives darkness as his excuse: he did not recognize the woman in the dark. Then the mother is requested to sleep with some kind of rags or bast-shoes on her feet. If after that the father makes another mistake, all the sons give him such a thrashing that the mother does not need any marks of distinction on her feet again.

Since "the daughter-in-law is of strange bone," and: "The cuckoo is not a bird, the daughter-in-law is not a daughter"; "When her husband dies, the daughter-in-law is out of place." If she likes, she may leave the house of her in-laws, especially when she has no children. She is allowed to take along all her personal belongings and, in some places, part of her hus-

⁸ Société Scientifique de Chevtchenko a Leopold. Matériaux pour l'ethnologie ukraino-ruthène.

band's clothes. To give the widow the son's portion of land would be considered a great injustice, because the son was working for the whole family, and therefore the whole family must use his plot. Besides, it would really ruin many families.

The relations between brothers and sisters-in-law are naturally very unfriendly: "Two daughters-in-law in one house and a dog between them." "The sister-in-law does not care if the brother-in-law is hungry: he may not eat at all or just die." "God-given sisters are like the burning nettle." But the relations between brothers and sisters are generally very good: "A brother is a strip of his brother's flesh." "A brother's love is better protection than a stone wall." If the people live in harmony: "They live like a brother and sister." The brother is the natural protector and defender of his sister. At the same time: "The brother loves a rich sister, the husband loves a healthy wife," and "The sister loves a rich brother." "The match-maker likes the girl with a rich brother; but if the girl is poor, her own brother will forget her."

In general, as among any nationality, among the Russians: "Relatives naturally hang together." "Even though a pine is in an open field, it murmurs to the pine-wood." "When I don't see my relatives I miss them, but when I see them, and marry bad ones among them, I feel that I am better off without them." "Relatives are loved from afar; they bite when you come near them." Relatives are relatives only until you are in trouble. "Oh, relatives! Fear them like fire." "If you have relatives, you have trouble." "The daughter's children are the dearest." "Wherever the grandmother gets the food, she has to feed her grandson." "Feed the grandfather when he is on the oven and you'll be there yourself." "Don't laugh at the old people—you'll be old yourself." "One would gladly be the nephew of a rich uncle." But: "Live with a nephew—hold on to the door; live with a son—rest on the oven."

IV

CONCLUSION

THE preceding chapter was devoted to tracing through the medium of popular proverbs the different phases of family life among the masses of the Russian people. Modern Russian society is apt to decry these old proverbs dealing with the period of heathenism or with the Christian epoch, on the ground that they represent conditions totally foreign to it. But is that correct?

All real popular proverbs are distinguished by a vivid phraseology and a direct view of things which are inherent to a primitive people. In this form they constitute a necessity in the life of a people, arouse general sympathy and approval and become popular. The newer the proverbs, the less characteristic they are of the entire people. Modern proverbs are rather stiff anachronisms, because the people as a whole have outlived the period of proverbs. Having reached the logical clearness of thought society stops creating proverbs because "The proverb is not said for nothing," "The proverb hits you not in the eye-brow, but in the eye proper," and society is not inclined to expose its innermost convictions. While there are undoubtedly some proverbs, especially historical, pertaining to the peasants only, the great majority of them reflect the moral development of the whole nation, corresponding to its constant growth and change for better and for worse. Even the form of the proverbs, irrespective of their inner content, proves that the whole people have lived through several stages

of mental development, forming new ideas and changing and renouncing old ones. Old proverbs characterize so concisely and picturesquely the spirit of whole historical epochs, as well as episodes and individuals, that although many of them have lost their original significance, although their meaning is often obscure, they still are very popular and are used with different meaning, corresponding to the now existing conditions by all classes of people.

After all, it is not so long ago that there was substantially a unity of culture through all strata of Russian population. The division into social classes took place in the second half of the XVc. Due to the geographic isolation of Russia from the countries of Western culture, and to the general low level of civilization in Russia, the economic status long remained the chief distinction between the different classes of society. As was said in another place, there has never been a true aristocracy in Russia, but the governmental and the military services were open exclusively to the nobility. Peter the Great, whose basic principle was the preference of personal merit and ability to the social rank, transformed at the beginning of the XVIIIc. a menial into a copyist, a copyist into a clerk of the chancellor's office, a clerk into an official. Military service became compulsory for all classes of population, with a chance for advancement open to everyone. Peter's "Table of Rank" made it possible for many persons of the lower classes to reach the rank of nobility, and thus mix the blue blood with the red. The masses were quick to summarize Peter's reforms in the following proverb: "Social rank does not count on the battlefield," and "Birth is no handicap in the service." "Cut our heads off, but leave our beards," was the reaction of all classes of the people, with few exceptions, to Peter's efforts to westernize them externally. The beard has always been considered sacred by the Russians, because Christ had one.

The character of a people, as that of an individual, is best reflected in its private life, in the thousands of details with which it surrounds itself in its every-day life, in its customs and traditions, in its beliefs and amusements, in its family life, its ideas of marriage and divorce. Individuals may change their convictions, but the nation in its entirety is always true to itself. Not only the proverbs, but all of the written history and literature prove that very conclusively. Of course, belles-lettres cannot be accepted as basic data for characterizing the mode of life of any given epoch, yet it may serve as good illustrative material. Russian literature is exceptionally truthful in its reflection of the spirit of different classes of society because it has always been practically the only channel for self-expression, and for social and political propaganda. Yet it exhibits curious limitations due to governmental censorship.

Nicholas I is credited with saying: "I do not understand why Russia needs the press, so long as there is a department of the gendarmery established to protect the unfortunate and the oppressed." His successors shared his views and spared no effort to crush free thought and the press. They all considered censorship quite necessary. Police officials, army officers, land owners and the most loyal professors were appointed as censors.

The Department of the Interior published a special book of circulars, interdictions and punishments for the press. Among the topics "of state importance" the discussion of which was forbidden, were the following: the government, the church, peasant uprisings, the workingman, fist fights between a count and a prince over a ballet dancer, cases of officials accused of theft, strikes, the emigration of the Dukhobors to America, the army prisons, the gendarmery, censorship, the French revolution, anarchism, schools, civil marriage, popular government, etc. The words: constitution, socialism, political

freedom, meetings, bureaucracy, reaction, revolution, were tabooed.

For the word "freedom" the censor would substitute the phrase: "the will of the worshipped Monarch." The word "evolution" was not to be used as sounding almost like "revolution." In a book about birds the expression: "the doves live in couples—a male and a female" was considered improper, because the holy spirit appeared in the form a dove. A poet who expressed his desire to fly with his beloved into "the uninhabited heavenly sphere" was reminded that no Russian citizen is allowed to fly anywhere without the permission from the government.

After the manifesto of October 17, 1905, censorship was nominally revoked, but in fact it became even more severe, police officials and spies being among the censors.

The Russian writers of the XVIIIc. and XIXc. gave varied accounts of life in the city and in the country. In their description, as in reality, there were too many contradictions: gross antiquity collided at each step with the light-hearted innovations which were the result of the superficially grafted Western civilization. The old nobility jostled cheek by jaws with the new nobility. The ancient country traditions resisted the city influences, etc. The education of the young generation and the question of marriage and divorce occupied the best minds of that period. The Westerners and the Slavophiles each expressed their views on family life and were more or less convincing in their arguments for the need or needlessness of change, and more or less successful in getting a following.

The most remarkable monument of Russian literature dealing with family life is the *Domostroy*, as we have seen. No single piece of literature in Russia and perhaps anywhere, has had such a deep and lasting influence upon the form of family organization and family relations. Written in the XVIc.

for the higher society and strictly adhered to by it during the Moscow period, it became and remained a source of unquestioned authority for the middle classes, especially for the merchants, and served as a true prototype for the peasant family life of today.

The peasants have preserved the patriarchal form of the *Domostroy* family more than any other class of Russian society. The peasant father and husband is the indisputable head of the family, the patriarch, the teacher, the judge, and the arbiter. For that matter, "The husband is the real chief" on every rung of the social ladder in Russia, and even more so among non-peasants, especially among the commoners and the merchants. This can be easily explained by the greater importance of the peasant woman as an economic factor. She is valued higher among the peasants because her work is too important. She is her husband's business partner, so to say, his co-worker, while the great majority of women of other classes depend entirely upon their husbands and fathers for their support and are looked down upon as somewhat parasitic creatures.

The patriarchal or semi-patriarchal form of family still exists more or less among other classes, especially among the merchants. Here the father and husband, the head of the family is in many cases not only an absolute ruler, but a senselessly cruel master, whimsical, unreasonable, despotic, often only because he has no other sphere in which he could display his power, because he has surplus of energy which can find no other application. The low level of education limits his mental horizon, his social interests are few; political life does not concern him.

The peasant woman of today is, like the ideal wife of the *Domostroy* family, her husband's efficient but silent partner. She knows every detail of the housework, can teach and control servants if she has any, but can do and does everything

herself in most cases, is worrying incessantly, caring for her husband's interests and assisting him in every possible way. She even helps him with his work in the field. And with all that she is silent as far as the relations with the outside world are concerned. The household, the home is her domain. Bearing and rearing children is her destiny.

In this connection it is interesting to note that those are exactly the views on woman of the foremost Russian writer of the XIXc., Count Leo Tolstoy. He thinks that it will always be a pity to see a woman of child-bearing age engaged in any field of masculine work. Such a woman, to him, is even more pitiable than fertile ground covered with gravel, which will transform it into a place for a promenade, because such ground could bear merely grain, while the woman could produce the most sacred of beings, man.

Strangely enough, despite the fact that by her work and the role she plays in the upkeep of the household the woman fully deserves to be her husband's equal, the peasant considers her as much of a dependent as was the wife of his *Domostroy* prototype. He also thinks himself responsible for her soul and tries to save it by "teaching" her by the *Domostroy* methods. He beats her as often, perhaps even more often than the *Domostroy* husband, and not as gently, disregarding in his ignorance the special rules of the *Domostroy*, which forbid hitting certain parts of the body with fists or feet.

The merchant, as also the peasant, upholds the *Domostroy* ideal of living in peace and piety, which would give pleasure to himself and arouse the envy of others who are not so lucky. But this is easier said than done. The merchant's wife is as dependent as the peasant's wife. In fact, her position is in many respects even worse than the position of the peasant woman. She has usually had some education, and that makes it harder for her to stand the same kind of "teaching" that the peasant woman gets.

It is harder for a merchant or a land owner to choose a suitable wife than for the peasant, because: "If you have a titled lady, she will not know how to go about her work." "If you take a girl from the nobility you have to buy her many clothes." "If you take an official's daughter you must know the ways of her parents' life." "If you have a city dweller you have to give up farming." "If you take a clergyman's daughter she will tease you." Moreover, "The clergymen's daughters are like blue horses; they are seldom any good." "If you take a suburb dweller you must keep a lot of wine." "If you take a factory girl you will never have a home." "If you take a peasant girl you have to retire from society." "If you take a serf you will be laughed at."

Children of all classes of society, just as the children of the peasants, seldom marry persons of their own choice. The girls especially are considered to be too inexperienced to be trusted with such an important matter. It is too easy to deceive a girl. Love is desirable, but it is not the prime consideration. The girl is supposed to fall in love after she has married the man whom her father likes as a suitable son-in-law. It was like that in the XVIc.; it remained the same way in the XIXc. Merchants' daughters, especially those who were educated in boarding schools, prefer officials, army officers, and landlords to merchants, but their fathers are not as generous as rich American fathers in spending money for titled husbands for them.

The dowry is a very important consideration especially among the merchants. They are very businesslike in this respect, adhering to the old traditional idea of marriage as a business transaction. Marriage contracts of some sort or other are quite common among merchants, as they are among peasants. The wedding is also a very elaborate affair since it is the social sanction of the marriage. The merchants share the peasants' view of the marriage as primarily a social act.

Peasants and merchants have practically the same attitude toward their children, and it coincides with the attitude of the *Domostroy*. "Eggs do not teach the hen," and "Eyes do not grow above the forehead," agree the Russians in all walks of social life with the peasants, and establish their relations with their children accordingly. To the great majority, "Innovations are crooked; the older the straighter." So they all "Cut a new coat but measure it by the old one." In fact, all classes in Russia continue to look upon the children as dependents who owe their parents, especially the father, blind obedience, because he is their nourisher. Corporal punishment, and plenty of it, as the *Domostroy* prescribed, is still considered necessary. Strictness takes place of friendship. Respect for the head of the family is recognized equally from the wife and the children.

On the whole, family life and the relations between different members of the family are almost the same in all classes of society. They are very much like those depicted by the proverbs in the preceding chapter.

Dobrolyubov, one of the best Russian critics of the XIXc., thus summarizes, in his book "The Kingdom of Darkness," a criticism of the dramas of Ostrovsky, the family life of the merchants and petty officials: "The mutual enmity among the members of the family, the struggle for existence in the family, yearning of personality, crushed by the family despotism, for some means of relieving its yoke and protect its life, we can observe even today in the patriarchal family of the contemporary kingdom of darkness. . . . Here everybody is in the state of war: the wife with the husband over his arbitrariness, the husband with the wife over her disobedience or lack of subservience; parents with children because the children want to live according to the dictates of their own minds, children with parents because the latter do not permit them to use their own brains, etc. External submissiveness

and dull, concentrated grief, leading to perfect idiotism and most lamentable depersonalization, intertwine in the dark kingdom with slavish cunning, most hideous deceit and most shameless false-heartedness. Here nobody can rely upon anybody: you may expect any minute that your friend will boast of how cleverly he has cheated or robbed you; the father-in-law will deceive his son-in-law in the matter of dowry; the bridegroom will cheat and insult the match-maker; the engaged daughter will fool her father and mother; the wife will deceive her husband. Nothing holy, nothing pure, nothing right in this dark world: domineering waywardness, wild, heartless, and unjust, has driven out of it every vestige of honor and right. . . . And they cannot exist where human dignity, freedom of personality, faith in love and happiness, and sanctity of honest labor have been turned to dust and insolently crushed by wilful and stupid persons."

Conditions have not changed much since Dobrolyubov's time, so that on the whole a comparison of the views of different classes on questions of marriage and divorce, and family relations in general show that not only are the peasants upholding the old traditions and customs which were common to the whole nation not so long ago, but that those traditions and customs still persist among the non-peasant part of Russian population despite the drafting of the Western civilization. "There is no smoke without a fire." The peasants are the smoke of the old Russian fire. The Russian society as a whole proves how right the peasants are in saying: "An old proverb will never break down," and "What mother puts into the child's head, the father will not knock out."

Father Peter or Petrograd has proved powerless to knock out what Mother Moscow had put into the Russians' heads.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKSAKOV, S. T.—Ocherk pomieshchichago byta v nachalye nynyeshnyago vyeka. Russkii Arkhiv, 1868.
- ALTSHULER—Znachenve vienchanya dlya braka v yego istoricheskom razvitii na Rusi.
- AMFITEATROV, A.—Zhenshchina v obshchestvennykh dvizhenyakh Rossii, Geneva, Tip. Bunda, 1905.
- ARTZYBASHEV, I.—O pervobytnoy Rossii i yeya zhitelyakh.
- AVDYEYEVA, E. A.—Zapiski o starom i novom russkom bytii.
- AVSYEYENKO, V.—Pisma o zhenshchinakh.
- BESTUZHEV-RYUMIN—Russkaya Istoria.
- BOGDANOVSKII—Russkia poslovitzy.
- BUSLAYEV, F. I.—Narodnaya Poezia. St. Petersburg, Imperatorskaya Akademia Nauk, 1887.
- BYLINY.
- DAL, V. I.—Poslovitzy russkago naroda, St. Petersburg, 1879.
- DANILOV, M. B.—Zapiski. Otgoloski Minuvshago, 1913, v. 1.
- DAVYDOV, N. V.—Iz proshlago. Moscow, 1913.
- DAVYDOV, N. V.—Iz pomieshchichiey zhizni 40-50 kh gg. Golos Minuvshago, 1916, no. 2.
- DIAKONOV, M.—Ocherki obshchestvennago i gosudarstvennago stroya v drevney Rusi. Pravo, 1908.
- DIVOV, P. G.—Peterburg v 1827 i 1828gg. Russkaya Starina, 1898, v. 1, v. 3.
- DZHANSHYEV—Epokha velikikh reform.
- DOBROVOLSKY, V. I.—Brak i razvod.
- DOMOSTROY.

- DUBASOV, I. I.—K istorii okraino-russkago byta i kolonizatsii 17–18 v. Russkoye Obozryenie, 1892, v. 5.
- DUBASOV, I. I.—Cherty okraino-russkago byta 17–18 v., Russkoye Obozryenie, 1891, v. 9.
- DUBROVIN, N. F.—Russkaya zhizn v nachalye 19 v. Russkaya Starina, 1898, no. 12; 1899, no. 1–8; 1899, v. 97–99; 1900, v. 103–4; 1901, v. 107–8; 1902, c. 109, 111–112; 1903, v. 113.
- EFIMENKO, A.—Izsledovaniya narodnoy zhizni, 1884.
- EFIMENKO, A.—Yuzhnaya Rus.
- EKATERINA II.—Sochineniya.
- ERMOLOV, A.—Narodnaya selsko-khozyaistvennaya mudrost v poslovitsakh, pogovorkakh i primietakh. Zhurnal Min. Nar. Prosv., St. Petersburg, 1903, v. 3.
- EVREINOV, G. A.—Proshloye i nastoyashcheye znachenie russkago dvoryanstva.
- EVARNITZKY, D. I.—Volnosti zaporozhskikh kazakov.
- ETNOGRAFICHESKOYE OBOZRYENIE, 1889.
- ETNOGRAFICHESKOYE OBOZRYENIE, kn. 3.
- ETNOGRAFICHESKYE OCHERKI YUZHNOY SIBIRI. BIBLIOTEKA DLYA CHTENIA, 1848, v. 5.
- FADYEYEV, R.—Russkoye obshchestvo v nastoyashchem i budushchem.
- FIRSOV, N. N.—Istoricheskaya kharakteristika i eskizy.
- GARSHIN, E. M.—Semya v proshedshem. Istoricheskii Vyestnik, 1885, v. 22.
- GEORGYEVSKY, V. P.—Iz staro-moskovskoy zhizni. Russkoye Obozryenie, 1894, v. 5.
- GLINSKY, B. B.—Ocherki russkago progressa.
- GOLTZOV, V.—Zhenshchina.
- GOLTZOV, V.—Zakonodatelstvo i nrayy v Rossii 18 v.
- GORSKY, S.—Russkaya zhenshchina 18 v.
- GRIGOROVSKY, S.—Sbornik tzerkovnykh i grazhdanskikh zakonov o brakye i razvodye.

- GRIGOROVSKY, SUVOROV & GUREVITCH—Brak, razvod, roditeli, dyeti.
- I. R. G. (Izd. I. GOLDBERGA)—Zhenshchina v semeynoy i sotsialnoy zhizni.
- IKONNIKOV, N. B.—Russkaya zhenshchina nakanunye reformy Petra Velikago.
- ILLIUSTROV, I. I.—Zhizn russkago naroda v yego poslovitsakh i pogovorkakh, Moscow, 1915.
- JORDAN & DEMBINSKAYA—Shkola zhenshchin.
- ISPOLATOVA, S.—Samosoznanie zhenshchiny, kak factor obnovenia obshchestvennago stroya.
- KAVELIN, K. D.—Mysli i zamyetki o russkoy istorii. Vyestnik Evropy, 1866, II.
- KHARUZIN, N.—Sbornik svyedenii dlya izuchenia krestyanskago naselenia Rossii.
- KAVELIN, K. D.—Byt russkago naroda, St. Petersburg, 1904.
- KAZINA, A.—Dolya zhenshchiny.
- KLYUCHEVSKY—Skazania inostrantsev o moskovskom gosudarstve.
- KNYAZEV, V.—Rus—Sbornik izbrannykh poslovits, 1924.
- KOLLONTAY, A. M.—Rabotnitsa-mat.
- KOLLONTAY, A. M.—Rabotnitsa i krestyanka v Sovyetskoi Rossii.
- KOSTOMAROV, N. I.—Ocherk domashney zhizni i nravov velikorusskago naroda.
- KOVALEVSKY, M.—Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia, London, D. Nutt, 1891.
- KOVALEVSKY, M.—Rodovoi byt v nastoyashshem, nedavnem i otдалennom proshlom, 1905.
- KRASNOZHEN, M.—Starye i novye zakony o brakye.
- LAZAREVSKY, V. A.—Novya dyevushki. Novoye Vremya, 1916.
- LEVITZKY, O.—Obychnya formy zaklyuchenia braka v yugo-

- zapadnoi Rusi v 16-17 v. Trudy 11 Arkheologicheskago Siezda, 2.
- LEVITZKY, O.—O semeynykh otnosheniakh v yugo-zapadnoi Rusi v 16-17 v.
- LUKHMANOVA—Sputnik Zhenshchiny.
- MAKARIJ, EPISKOP TOMSKII I BARNAULSKII—Obrazovanie, prava i obyazannosti zhenshchin.
- MATERIALI DO UKRAINSKOY RUSSKOY ETNOGRAFIJ.
- MELGUNOV, P. E.—Russkii byt 18 v.
- MERI-KHOYI—Sbornik poslovits, pogovorok, primyet i. t. d.
- MYAKOTIN, V. A.—Iz istorii russkago obshchestva, St. Petersburg, 1906.
- MIKHAILOV, M.—Iz npravov 18 v.
- MIKHNEVICH, V.—Russkaya zhenshchina 18 v.
- MILYUKOV, P. N.—Ocherki po istorii russkoy kultury.
- MORDOVTSSEV—Russkia istoritcheskia zhenshchiny.
- MOSTOVSKY—Etnograficheskie ocherki Rossii.
- NAZIMOV, M. L.—V provintsii i v Moskye. Russkii Vyestnik, 1876, no. 7.
- NIDERLE, L.—Byt i kultura drevnikh Slavyan.
- NIKOLAYEVA, M. K.—Derevnya v starinu. Syeverny Vyestnik, 1891, v. 2-3.
- NOSOVITCH, I. I.—Sbornik bielorussskikh poslovits. St. Petersburg, Imperatorskaya Akademia Nauk, 1874.
- OGLOBLIN, N. N.—Bytovya cherty 17 v. Russkaya Starina, 1892, no. 2, 3, 6, 10.
- ORSHANSKY, I. G.—Izsluyedovania po russkomu pravu. P. R.—Byt russkago naroda.
- PAKHMAN, S. V.—Ocherk narodnykh yuridicheskikh oby-
chaiev Smolenskoy gub.
- PAKHMAN, S. V.—Sbornik narodnykh yuridicheskikh oby-
chayev. Russk. Geogr. Obsh. v. 18.
- PELIKAN, A. A.—Vo vtoroy polovinye 19 v. Golos Minuv-
shago, 1914, no. 2-3.

- PETERSON, A. P.—Cherty starinnago dvoryanskago byta, Russkii Arkhiv, no. 2, Moscow, 1877.
- POKROVSKY, M. N.—Ocherk istorii russkoy kultury.
- POKROVSKY, V. I.—Zheny Dekabristov.
- POLONSKAYA, N.—Domashnii i obshchestvennii byt v Moskovskoy Rusi. Kiev, 1912.
- POSOSHKOV—Zavyeshchanie otecheskoye. Yunosti chistoye zertsalo.
- PROTOPOPOV, S.—Pouchenie Vladimira Monomakha. Zhurnal Min. Nar. Prosv. St. Petersburg, 1874, v. 171.
- PUPAREV, A.—Iz pomieshchichyago byta 18 v. Russkaya Starina, 1892, no. 7-8.
- PYLYAYEV—Staroye zhitie.
- ROMANOV, E.—Bielorusskii Sbornik, vyp. 1-4, 8-9. Vilna, 1886-1912.
- ROMANOVITCH-SLAVATINSKY—Dvoryanstvo v Rossii ot nachala 18 v. do otmyeny kyepostnogo prava.
- ROZANOV, V. V.—Semeynii vopros v Rossii.
- RUSSKII BYT—18 v. Sbornik. 2 vos., Moscow, 1914.
- RUSSKIE DYEYATELI V PORTRETAKH. Izdanie Russkaya Starina, v. 5.
- B. S.—Iz nedavnyago proshlago, Russkaya Starina, 1910, v. 143.
- SAKHAROV—Skazania russkago naroda.
- SALTYKOV, M. E.—A family of noblemen.
- SHABANOVA, A.—Ocherk zhenskago dvizhenia v. Rossii.
- SHASHKOVA, S. S.—Istoria russkoy zhenshchiny.
- SHCHAPOV, A.—Sozialno pedagogicheskia uslovie razvitiia russkago naroda.
- SHCHEBALSKY, P. K. - Cherty iz narodnoy zhizni 18 v. Otechestvennyia Zapiski, 1861, v. 10.
- SHCHEPKINA, E.—Starinnye pomieshchiki na sluzhbye i doma.
- SHCHERBATOV, M. M.—O povrezhdenii pravoy v Rossii, London: Trübner and Co., 1858.

- SHEIN, P. V.—Materialy dlya izucheniia byta i yazyka russkago naseleniia syeverno—zapadnago kraya. Sbornik Russkago Yazyka i Slovesnosti. Imperatorskaya Akademiia Nauk, 1893, v. 57; 1890, v. 51; 1903, v. 72.
- SHEIN, N. V.—Bielorusskii Sbornik. Sbornik Otdyeleniia Russkago Yazyka i Slovesnosti. Imperatorskaya Akademiia Nauk, v. 41, 1887–1902.
- SIMONI, I.—Starinnye sborniki russkikh poslovits, pogovorok, zagadok i pr. 16–19, St. Petresburg, 1899.
- SKALKOVSKY, K. A.—Malenkaya khrestomatia dlya vzroslykh. (Mnienia russkikh o samikh sebie.)
- SLAVUTINSKY, S. G.—Iz semeynykh vospominanii. Russkii Vyestnik, 1881, v. 152.
- SMIRNOV —Ocherki semeynykh otnoshenii po obychnomu pravu russkago naroda.
- SNIEGIRIOV, I. M.—Russkia poslovitsy i pritchi, 1848.
- SHOMPULEV, V. V.—Provintsialnye typy 40 kh godov. Russkaya Starina, 1898, no. 8.
- SHOMPULEV, V. V.—Iz zapisok starago pomieschchika. Russkaya Starina, 1908, v. 135.
- SOCIÉTÉ SCIENTIFIQUE DE CHYATCHENKO À LEOPOL —Materiaux pour l'ethnologie ukraino-russe, v. 8.
- SOBOLEVSKY, A. K istorii narodnykh prazdnikov v Velikoy Rusi.
- SOKOLOV, M. E. Obryady, povyeria i suevyeria velikorussov Saratovskoy gub., Trudy Saratovskoy uchenoi arkhivnoi kommissii, Vyp. 33, 1916.
- SOLOVYEV, V.—Istoria Rossii.
- SUMTZOV, N. F. —Opit istoricheskago izucheniia malorusskikh poslovits. Kharkov, 1897 (Sbornik Kharkovskago istorisophilologicheskago obshchestva).
- SUMAROKOV, P. P.—Derevenskia pisma, v. 4, 5, 10, 11, 12.
- SUVOROV, P. S.—Grazhdansky brak.
- TATISHCHEV, S. S.—Aleksandr II.

- TERESHCHENKO, A.—Byt russkago naroda.
- TIKHONRAVOV, N. C.—Russkia byling staroi i novoi zapisi, Moscow, 1894.
- TSVYETAYEV, D. M.—Iz istorii brachnykh diel v tsarskoi semye moskovskago perioda.
- CHETCHULIN, N. D.—Russkii provintsialny byt 18 v.
- CHULKOV, M. D.—Slovar Russkikh Suevyeri. St. Petersburg, 1782.
- CHUZHIBINSKY, A.—Ocherki proshlago. Vremya, 1862, v. II—12.
- YASHCHURZHINSKY—Svadba malorusskaya, kak religiozno-obryadovaya drama. Kievskaya Starina, 1896.
- ZABYELIN, I.—Domashnii byt russkikh tsarey.
- ZABYELIN, I.—Domashnii byt russkikh tsarits.
- ZABYLIN, M.—Russkii narod-yego obychai, obryady, predania, suevyeria i poesia, Moscow, 1880.
- ZHELOBOVSKY, A. I.—Semya po vozzryeniam russkago naroda.
- ZAYTZEV, I. K.—Vospominania starago uchitelya, Russkaya Starina, 1887, v. 54.
- ZAGOROVSKY—Semeynoye Pravo.
- ZAPISKI WEBERA—Russkii Arkhiv, 1872, no. 7—8.

83
66
127

DATE DUE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DE 1 0 '91

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

3 5282 00339 1375

9453

~~392~~
E48

STACKS DK32.E5 1926a c. 9453

Elnett, Elaine Pasvolsky.

Historic origin and social development o



3 5282 00339 1375